

THE ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR JULY, 1815.

Art. I. *Remarks upon the systematical Classification of Manuscripts, adopted by Griesbach in his Edition of the Greek Testament.* By Richard Laurence, LL.D. pp. 135. Parker, Oxford; Rivingtons, London. 1814.

IT must be obvious to every reader who is at all acquainted with sacred criticism, that had the first editors of the printed Greek text of the New Testament, possessed the means of preparing an edition, which are now accessible to the critic, the text of their editions would have been in some respects different; many readings adopted by them would have been omitted, and many which they omitted would have been inserted. The materials which Erasmus and the editors of the *Complutensian Polyglot* employed, were too imperfect to give the highest value to their editions. The Elzevir text of 1624, which became the received text, and which was copied, through the medium of Beza's, from the edition of Robert Stephens, in 1550, united the readings of the *Erasmian* and the *Complutensian* editions, and cannot therefore pretend to unimpeachable authority. The Greek text was still open to revision, and still susceptible of emendation. The editions of Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein, though of great importance, presented the text of 1624. No attempt was made to reform and perfect the constitution of the Greek text of the New Testament, on *critical principles*, till Griesbach engaged in the arduous work of completely revising and settling it. The result of his labours was the publication, at Halle, in Saxony, of his edition of the Greek Testament, in two volumes; the first volume, in 1796, the second in 1806. We take notice of this edition only, because it entirely supersedes the first edition published in 1775, and 1777.

VOL. IV. N. S.

B

Innovation is generally viewed with jealousy, and excites alarm. Many persons who exclaim against new translations and new editions, do not, or will not consider, that the edition or the version, to which they are most strongly attached, was once new. They do not reflect that the critical office, the duties of which literary men of our own age are discharging, had been assumed by the learned of a former day. If it was right in Stephens, or Beza, to publish an edition of any part of the Scriptures from manuscripts, it could not be wrong in Griesbach, or in any other competent person, to publish an edition of the same, or of any other part of the Bible. The only question of importance is, not whether an edition of the Scriptures is old or new, but whether any particular edition, is the best that can be obtained; or which of various editions, approximates nearest to the original state of the writings as left by their authors. It is really pitiable to reflect on the opposition of Dr. John Owen, to the publication of the various readings imbodyed in the *London Polyglot*; and in the manner in which Whitby, a critic by profession, suffered his mind to be disturbed by the edition of Mill's Greek Testament.

Though just notions on the subject of various readings, and on the application of them to the correction of the text, were more generally entertained when Griesbach meditated his first edition, he proceeded to execute his plan with caution; and thought it necessary to obviate suspicions and accusations prejudicial to his religious opinions, by a declaration of his sentiments on a leading point in theology. Our own observation and experience convince us that there are persons in whose eyes it would be an indication of a departure from the faith, in any man who might hint the corruption of a passage in the received text, or in the public version of the Scriptures, and propose its amendment by substituting a various reading. The old *mumpsimus* must not be changed for the new *sumpsimus*. As we are not sure that every reader of our work, who is acquainted with the name of Griesbach, is also informed of the theological principles of this distinguished critic, who was a member of the Lutheran Church, and as we should feel gratified in removing any prejudice against the use of his valuable work, we shall translate part of the preface to the second volume of the New Testament, first edition, 1775. 'I publicly profess and declare before God, that I have never questioned the truth of that Article (the true Divinity of Christ). There are so many clear passages, and so many decisive arguments in the sacred writings by which the true Deity of Christ may be proved, that, I confess, I can scarcely understand how

‘ any person, the Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures
 ‘ being admitted, and genuine rules of biblical interpretation
 ‘ being maintained, can dispute the truth of that doctrine.
 ‘ The first three verses of the Gospel according to John,
 ‘ especially, are so luminous, and so much above exception,
 ‘ that they can never be subverted, or wrested from the
 ‘ defenders of the truth, by the daring attempts of either
 ‘ critics, or interpreters.’

But few instances occur in the annals of literary history of an author’s possessing so much of the general estimation in his life time as was enjoyed by the late Professor Griesbach. The different classes of theologians not only admired his critical sagacity, and his learning, but they united in applauding his candour and impartiality; qualities which, it is to be regretted, are not always associated with extensive erudition. The solidity of his learning and the accuracy of his judgement were indeed questioned by Matthæi; but his accusations discover the bitterness of his spirit as a personal opponent, and were conveyed in terms rude and offensive.

Griesbach’s second edition of the New Testament, is well entitled to rank among the most laborious efforts of the learned. It contains the results of many years’ close application to the collation of manuscripts, and to the investigation of their various readings, and presents a text which has received the approbation of the most eminent scholars. It may, however, have been more warmly applauded, and more frequently quoted, than carefully examined; and the praises of its admirers may not always have proceeded from careful endeavours to appreciate its value. Its authority has been, and still is, great beyond precedent, and the decisions of Griesbach are received with little less than oracular deference. As enlightened minds pay deference only to truth, as every Christian must feel deeply interested, if not in the process, yet in the result, of critical investigation, and as in every particular which concerns the records of our faith the nicest caution ought to be exercised; it is the duty of every competent person who is anxious to possess the word of God in purity, minutely to examine a system which promises to secure it against corruption; to review the premises, and to weigh the conclusions of Griesbach; that approbation may be given to truth, and not to error, and that commendations and confidence may have the support of fidelity. We are therefore glad that Dr. Laurence has invited the attention of the learned to the system of Griesbach; and we shall be happy in witnessing the discussion of a subject which we apprehend is yet very imperfectly understood, and the eluci-

4 Laurence on Griesbach's Classification of MSS.

dation of which requires extensive research, and great critical skill.

In a work of such difficulty as Griesbach has performed, in which so many thousand intricate comparisons have been made, and so many thousand authorities are quoted, we cannot indeed expect perfection. It must also be recollected that probability in its different degrees, and not certainty, is the end of criticism. Every candid examiner of Griesbach, therefore, must be prepared to meet mistakes, and to pardon errors, if they be not different in kind, nor of more frequent occurrence, than may fairly be attributed to human infirmity.

In the second volume of the Greek Testament, ed. 1806, p. 112. Acts xx. 28. Griesbach inserts *τον κυριου* in the text, in the place of *του θεου*, the common reading; but he has omitted to insert the article *του* before *θεου* in the inner margin; and as the article *του* inserted in the text before *κυριου* is in small letters, the same as *κυριου*, the reader is thus erroneously informed that the received text has only *θεου*. In his note on the same reading, he informs us that the Æthiopic version has a word in this passage, which it always uses, whether the Greek text reads *κυριος* or *θεος*. If this be the fact, it is evident that the Æthiopic version can never be quoted for *θεος* against *κυριος*, nor, *vice versa*, for *κυριος* against *θεος*: yet, in the same volume, p. 398. Colossians, iii. 22. he inserts *κυριου* in the text, and rejects *θεου* into the inner margin, precisely as in Acts xx. 28. and in the note (n) he gives the Æthiopic version in the list of authorities for *κυριου*.

In the second volume of his *Symbolæ Criticæ*, printed in 1793, he has published extracts from the works of Origen, purporting to be complete; and in the *Prolegomena* to the New Testament, p. 55, he informs us, that he has very carefully marked the readings of Origen. This Father is however sometimes quoted in the New Testament for readings which are not found in the *Symbolæ*. Rom. ix. 19. Origen is quoted, together with manuscripts, versions, and Fathers, for the addition of *γαρ*, but no such reading appears in the *Symbolæ Criticæ*. 1 Cor. v. 2. *πραξας* for *ποιησας* A. C. 17, Or. but in the *Symbolæ*, there is no reading of the kind. 1 Tim. vi. 19. *οὕτως* instead of *αἰωνιον*. A D E F G, Or. but Origen does not quote the verse. There are other instances of the same kind, some of which are noticed by Dr. Laurence.

Griesbach's decisions on passages in the New Testament, are sometimes at variance with the judgement pronounced upon them in the *Symbolæ Criticæ*. Rom. ix. 31. the latter *δικαιοσυνης* has the mark of probable omission prefixed on the authority of A B D E F G 47. 67. + + Copt. Patr. (N. T.

p. 196.) Its omission, however, is, in the *Symbolæ*, vol. ii. p. 627. marked as *improbable*, and the following reason is assigned for its being retained. 'Posset quidem ex antecedenti repetitum videri, eamque ob causam Millius omissionem probavit. Nec causa apparet ulla, cur vel deleteretur, vel præteriretur. Verum sensus admodum turbatur, si *δικαιοσύνης* juguletur.' 1 Cor. vi. 9. βασιλειαν θεου is transposed in the New Testament on the authority of A B D, 17. 37, 46. but in the *Symbolæ*, vol. ii. p. 96. the variation is marked scarcely probable: 'Inusitatum scriptoribus sacris!'

In the emendations proposed by Griesbach, the soundness of his judgement may sometimes be questioned, as in Rom. xi. 19. where the article *οι* has the highest mark of probable omission prefixed, and of which he says in the *Symbolæ*: 'Ob testium consentientium numerum omnino eliminandum putarem, nisi fieri potuisset ut omitteretur a nonnullis qui secum reputarent, non omnes, sed nonnullos tantum *κλαδους* esse rescisos, nec animadverterent Exgentilem, Judæorum contemptorem hic induci loquentem.' The article *οι* appears to be necessary, and is used definitely in relation to "the branches broken off," which are the subject of the Apostle's notice in this passage, and which are expressly mentioned in the 17th verse. Matthæi is of opinion that the article is to be retained.

These instances, and a few more of a similar kind, cannot, however, be considered as more than pardonable inaccuracies. By men of learning and candour they will not be viewed either as affecting Griesbach's reputation, or as affording occasion to depreciate his labours. We refer to them, not for the purpose of indulging in censure, but that we may excite the vigilance of the student in his perusal of Griesbach's volumes. The admirers of his critical system have now a more difficult duty to perform than to defend his name against the attacks of the petulant censor. The entire edifice of his criticism is threatened, and, according to the report of Dr. Laurence, the foundations of his system, which he imagined were well and strongly laid, are too insecure to afford stability to the structure which his skill and labour have erected.

Dr. Laurence points out several errors of Griesbach, separately from the examination which he institutes into the system of that critic. Though the temper with which he writes, is generally good, he is occasionally severe, and remarks with apparent harshness on the mistakes of his author. Dr. Laurence himself will, in the sequel, be found to need our indulgence, since his own collations are defective and erroneous. The object of his 'remarks' is not to dispute the general doctrine of a classification of Greek manuscripts,

6 Laurence on Griesbach's Classification of MSS.

though they tend to shew its impracticability, but to discuss the particular hypothesis of Griesbach. Of this hypothesis we shall endeavour to furnish a description as large and accurate as our limits will permit.

The basis of Griesbach's system, is the division of the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament into three classes, each of which is considered as an independent witness for the various readings which it contains. The value of a reading, so far as manuscript authority is regarded, is decided by Griesbach, not according to the number of individual manuscripts in which it is found, but according to the number of classes by which it is supported. The classes under which Griesbach arranges all the Greek manuscripts, are the three following: I. The Alexandrine. II. The Occidental or Western. III. The Oriental or Byzantine. To each of these he gives the name *Recension*, or, as we should say of printed books, *edition*: Dr. Laurence suggests that *Text* would be a more correct term.

The first class, or Alexandrine recension, comprises those manuscripts, which, in remarkable and characteristic readings, agree with the quotations of the early Alexandrine writers, Clement, Origen, Isidore, Athanasius, and Cyril. Of this description are the Codex Ephrem, marked C:—the Codex Alexandrinus, marked A: (but in the Epistles of Paul only:)—and the Colbert manuscript, marked 17. These are the principal manuscripts of the Alexandrine recension, to which a few others are but partially related. The following versions, as having been made from manuscripts of the Alexandrine class, are also ranged in this division; viz. the Coptic, the Æthiopic, the Armenian, and the Philoxenian Syriac. The Alexandrine Fathers, says Griesbach, scarcely ever agree in a reading, but the same is found in all, or nearly all the above manuscripts and versions; and a reading in which these latter agree, will generally be found in the writings of the former.

The Occidental or Western recension, includes such manuscripts as are accompanied with Latin versions, and agree with the quotations of Tertullian and Cyprian. This recension was used in Africa, Italy, Gaul, and other Western countries.

Another set of manuscripts agrees with the quotations of those writers who flourished in Greece, Asia-minor, and the neighbouring provinces, at the end of the fourth century, and in the fifth and the sixth centuries. This is the Oriental or Byzantine recension, to which the Greek text in common use, or the *textus receptus*, is conformable, as it appears

to have been edited from manuscripts of the Byzantine class.

In the Western provinces of Europe few Greek manuscripts were written after the fourth century; few in Egypt after the sixth; but in the East, Greek manuscripts were constantly multiplied, till the invention of printing superseded the necessity of writing out copies of the Scriptures. Few manuscripts, therefore, are supposed to preserve the Alexandrine and the Western recensions, while the number of the Byzantine class is proportionably great. No manuscript preserves any recension in a pure state, but manuscripts are said to be of the Alexandrine, or Western, or Byzantine recension, as the appropriate readings of each preponderate.

According to this system, the first object of the critic is, to discover the reading of each *recension* by a diligent comparison of the manuscripts which contain it. If the result of this comparison, as applied to all the recensions, give the same reading, it is to be accounted genuine so far as external evidence goes. Should the recensions not agree in the same reading, the critic must then weigh the probabilities of each reading by the rules of internal evidence, paying particular attention to the genius of each recension.

The Western preserves harsh readings, Hebraisms, and solecisms, which the Alexandrine has exchanged for readings more conformable to classic usage. The Western is characterized by readings calculated to relieve the text from difficulties, and to clear the sense. The Alexandrine is free from the interpretations and transpositions of the Western. 'Grammaticum egit Alexandrinus censor, interpretem occidentalibus.' An explanatory reading is therefore suspicious in the Western recension, and a classical one in the Alexandrine. The Byzantine preserves the Greek idiom still purer than the Alexandrine, and resembles the Western in its use of copious and explanatory readings. It is besides mixed throughout with the readings of the other recensions.

In deciding on the genuineness of a reading, so far as manuscript authority is concerned, it is immaterial whether the MSS. which support the reading of a particular recension, be many or few. A reading which can be clearly assigned to the Alexandrine and the Western recensions, is of greater manuscript authority than a Byzantine reading, though the latter may be found in a hundred manuscripts, and the former exist in only four or six. A majority of recensions, not a majority of MSS. determines the critic in his selection.

Such are the outlines of Griesbach's system, which Dr. Laurence reminds us was first projected by Bengel, and af-

terwards improved by Semler. In referring to its origin it was certainly not improper in him to mention these names : this however he might have done in a more courteous manner, and especially might he have spared the reflection that Griesbach held Semler's writings 'in the highest esteem ; ' perhaps the more so, because that adventurous critic was 'certainly never suspected of treading in the beaten track ' of preconceived opinion : '—a reflection which might doubtless have been applied to a follower of Luther, or a disciple of Newton, who deserted the beaten track of preconceived opinion in divinity, or in philosophy. An author should confine his remarks to the truth or the falsehood of opinions apart from the commonness or the novelty of them.

The system which we have just detailed, is not supported either by history or tradition. Griesbach himself remarks, ' *Origo variarum textus Novi Test. recensionum, deficientibus documentis satis vetustis ac testimoniis, historice declarari nequit.* ' *Prolegomena in N. T.* p. 74. The Alexandrine and the Western recensions, existed, according to Griesbach, at the beginning of the third century. Had they been produced by any critical revision of the text, it is scarcely probable that so important a circumstance would have been entirely unnoticed by ecclesiastical writers. No information, however, has been transmitted to us of any collation of manuscripts as the basis of an edition of the Christian Scriptures at so early a period. If a revision of the New Testament had taken place at Alexandria, at Carthage, or in Italy, and at Byzantium, in the second, or at the beginning of the third century, from which our existing manuscripts had been derived, this threefold classification would have had the semblance of truth as a general assumption ; but in the absence of every document which might supply knowledge of the kind in question, is it not easy to ask why the three recensions specified are exclusively adopted. If manuscripts at Alexandria be assumed as the source of one class of readings, why may not manuscripts at Antioch have produced another class ? Why may not the readings of manuscripts at Rome have given rise to a recension as different from that which was in use at Carthage, as the Byzantine is different from the Alexandrine ? That there might be an affinity in the copies of the New Testament in use in the same district, is very probable : but considering the extent of country over which Christianity was diffused during the first three centuries, and how greatly the number of the sacred writings must have been multiplied, are not the three varieties specified, if a classification be assumed, too limited a number to include the actual divisions ?

We are perfectly aware that the classification of Griesbach is adapted to the *existing* manuscripts of the New Testament, but is not the source whence they have been derived, of importance in the question?—and would not a very different result take place, if a manuscript which is supposed to have been written in Egypt, were written at Rome? If no early revision of the New Testament took place, and if any actual recension exist, to what but the contingencies of transcription can the affinities and differences of manuscripts be attributed? We know that variations from a particular text have been assigned to supposed early editions, from which certain passages were, it is said, expunged. But this is gratuitous supposition. There exists no proof that any critical edition of the New Testament was undertaken, and generally diffused, in the early periods of the Christian history; and before it is asserted that any particular words or verses were altered or expunged from the Christian Scriptures, it should first be proved that they previously existed in them. It never was in the power of any man, or of any set of men, to obtain possession of every copy of the New Testament, and to introduce alterations in them, or to replace all the existing copies with newly written ones. Eusebius has inserted in his life of Constantine*, a letter from that Emperor to himself, containing an order for the providing of fifty copies of the Scriptures, for the use of the new churches which he was erecting at Constantinople. The books were furnished, as appears from the subsequent chapter; but there is not a single word descriptive of their character in the whole account: the beauty and splendour of the copies were probably the only objects of attention. There are no premises from which any conclusion can be drawn relative to the state of the text in the time of Eusebius in this passage, and the subject is too important to allow the suggestions of mere fancy. Other instances might be referred to, did our limits permit, of assumed editions of the Scriptures in ancient times, as the ground work of hypotheses, which have no better evidence to support them than the preceding.

Griesbach's system is of a different kind; he was too sound a critic to impute to any meditated plan projected by ancient divines, the supposed alteration of the sacred word. He admits that the system which he adopts is destitute of historical support; and he founds it entirely on the coincidences of the respective documents arranged under each class. It is the result of synthetical process. To such a system it

* Lib. iv., c. xxxvi.

may, we think, fairly be objected, that our materials are neither so ample, nor so accurately adjusted, as to afford unexceptionable data for such an arrangement. As the system may lead us into error, it appears to us to be a better mode of proceeding, in forming our judgement of the goodness of a reading, to examine the witnesses which support it, apart from all hypothesis: and if we are not mistaken, this is the manner which Griesbach himself adopted in the general distribution of his various readings. Whatever proofs of the truth of his system may hereafter be obtained, and how generally soever it may be employed as a practical rule, we apprehend that there are but few corrections of the text in his New Testament, which would not have occupied a place in it in the entire absence of his system. With very high respect for Griesbach, we feel inclined to apply to his threefold classification of manuscripts the character which Mill gives of Stephens's collection of readings: 'In *pompam magis quam in usum congesta videtur.*' Whatever may become of his system, his Greek Testament will always retain its value.

Griesbach himself acknowledges, in the preface to an edition of the Gospels, published in 1777, the extreme difficulty of providing satisfactory data for the construction of his system. Nor had he at a later period obtained the means of removing the obstructions which impeded his critical progress; for in the preface to the first volume of the "*Symbolæ Criticæ*," published in 1785, he confesses that he was still deficient in materials suited to his purpose: '*Ingenue fateor, deesse mihi adhuc subsidia nonnulla, quibus carere non potest, qui discrimina non solum ac indolem, sed quod difficilius est, historiam etiam origines ac vicissitudines recensitionum veterum omnium ita declarare vult, ut asserta sua peritis arbitris probaturum se esse sperare haud immerito queat.*' Among these indispensable *subsidia* he reckons new and accurate collations of the principal Greek Fathers, Athanasius, Cyril, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. But these were still wanting when he published his second edition of the New Testament. According to his own account, therefore, he was unfurnished for the construction of this system, and began to build before the foundation was laid. Or, if this be considered as too severe an expression of our opinion, he applied his hypothesis as a rule of textual criticism, while it was in a state too imperfect to guide the judgement in its discriminations, and to justify our confidence in its results.

Our readers will have already perceived the direction of our minds in relation to this controversy, the subject of which, we think, is attended with great, probably insurmountable, difficul-

* Much more progress must, we apprehend, be made in Biblical Criticism, before our materials can be so discriminated and arranged, as to afford a solid basis for the system in question. An accurate classification of authorities,—and unless it be accurate, what purpose can it answer which is not as well, or, indeed, better accomplished without it?—an accurate classification of authorities must be preceded by an accurate knowledge of their respective characters.

That the labours of critics have been principally directed to the accumulation of materials, will be evident to every one who adverts to the number of known Greek manuscripts, and compares with them the small number which have been completely and nicely collated. The small letter manuscripts have been, in comparison with the uncial, almost neglected; and were some of them better known, their influence might not be unimportant on the question of classification. The following manuscripts, among others which Griesbach himself considers as of great importance, have been but very incompletely collated: viz.,—The Codex Regius, 2244^b; numbered 13 in Griesbach's catalogue; 103 in Michaelis's. The Codex Colbertinus 2844; numbered by Griesbach 33 in the Gospels, and 17 in the Epistles; in Michaelis's catalogue 92. The diligent study of the Moscow manuscripts, described by Matthæi, may probably be of great service toward a more accurate acquaintance with the affinities of manuscripts than we now possess. How little of the genealogical history of manuscripts is yet known! The origin of the most celebrated of them, the Codex Bezae, the Codex Alexandrinus, and the Codex Vaticanus, for example, is covered with obscurity.

But if our acquaintance with Greek manuscripts leaves so much to be supplied in our knowledge of the Greek text, our wants may be still the more felt when we advert to the versions. How far from perfect is our intimacy with the history of the Latin and the Syriac versions! Of the Coptic, Æthiopic, and Armenian versions, we know still less. The printed text of these versions does not appear to have been formed from a collation of manuscripts; and the Æthiopic version in particular seems to be an impression of the text of only one manuscript, and that an im-

* The difficulties of the subject were, we presume, felt by the learned Translator of Michaelis, since the remarks of his author on the affinity of the Greek manuscripts, in the eighth chapter of the Introduction to the New Testament, are passed over without comment, though an examination of the subject at large had been promised in the notes to the sixth chapter. Note 8. sect. 10.

may, we think, fairly be objected, that our materials are neither so ample, nor so accurately adjusted, as to afford unexceptionable data for such an arrangement. As the system may lead us into error, it appears to us to be a better mode of proceeding, in forming our judgement of the goodness of a reading, to examine the witnesses which support it, apart from all hypothesis: and if we are not mistaken, this is the manner which Griesbach himself adopted in the general distribution of his various readings. Whatever proofs of the truth of his system may hereafter be obtained, and how generally soever it may be employed as a practical rule, we apprehend that there are but few corrections of the text in his New Testament, which would not have occupied a place in it in the entire absence of his system. With very high respect for Griesbach, we feel inclined to apply to his threefold classification of manuscripts the character which Mill gives of Stephens's collection of readings: 'In pompan magis quam in usum congesta videtur.' Whatever may become of his system, his Greek Testament will always retain its value.

Griesbach himself acknowledges, in the preface to an edition of the Gospels, published in 1777, the extreme difficulty of providing satisfactory data for the construction of his system. Nor had he at a later period obtained the means of removing the obstructions which impeded his critical progress; for in the preface to the first volume of the "*Symbolæ Criticæ*," published in 1785, he confesses that he was still deficient in materials suited to his purpose: 'Ingenue fateor, deesse mihi adhuc subsidia nonnulla, quibus carere non potest, qui discrimina non solum ac indolem, sed quod difficilior est, historiam etiam origines ac vicissitudines recensitionum veterum omnium ita declarare vult, ut asserta sua peritis arbitris probaturum se esse sperare haud immerito queat.' Among these indispensable *subsidia* he reckons new and accurate collations of the principal Greek Fathers, Athanasius, Cyril, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. But these were still wanting when he published his second edition of the New Testament. According to his own account, therefore, he was unfurnished for the construction of this system, and began to build before the foundation was laid. Or, if this be considered as too severe an expression of our opinion, he applied his hypothesis as a rule of textual criticism, while it was in a state too imperfect to guide the judgement in its discriminations, and to justify our confidence in its results.

Our readers will have already perceived the direction of our minds in relation to this controversy, the subject of which, we think, is attended with great, probably insurmountable, difficul-

* Much more progress must, we apprehend, be made in Biblical Criticism, before our materials can be so discriminated and arranged, as to afford a solid basis for the system in question. An accurate classification of authorities,—and unless it be accurate, what purpose can it answer which is not as well, or, indeed, better accomplished without it?—an accurate classification of authorities must be preceded by an accurate knowledge of their respective characters.

That the labours of critics have been principally directed to the accumulation of materials, will be evident to every one who adverts to the number of known Greek manuscripts, and compares with them the small number which have been completely and nicely collated. The small letter manuscripts have been, in comparison with the uncial, almost neglected; and were some of them better known, their influence might not be unimportant on the question of classification. The following manuscripts, among others which Griesbach himself considers as of great importance, have been but very incompletely collated: viz.,—The Codex Regius, 2244^b; numbered 13 in Griesbach's catalogue; 203 in Michaelis's. The Codex Colbertinus 2844; numbered by Griesbach 33 in the Gospels, and 17 in the Epistles; in Michaelis's catalogue 92. The diligent study of the Moscow manuscripts, described by Matthæi, may probably be of great service toward a more accurate acquaintance with the affinities of manuscripts than we now possess. How little of the genealogical history of manuscripts is yet known! The origin of the most celebrated of them, the Codex Bezae, the Codex Alexandrinus, and the Codex Vaticanus, for example, is covered with obscurity.

But if our acquaintance with Greek manuscripts leaves so much to be supplied in our knowledge of the Greek text, our wants may be still the more felt when we advert to the versions. How far from perfect is our intimacy with the history of the Latin and the Syriac versions! Of the Coptic, Æthiopic, and Armenian versions, we know still less. The printed text of these versions does not appear to have been formed from a collation of manuscripts; and the Æthiopic version in particular seems to be an impression of the text of only one manuscript, and that an im-

* The difficulties of the subject were, we presume, felt by the learned Translator of Michaelis, since the remarks of his author on the affinity of the Greek manuscripts, in the eighth chapter of the Introduction to the New Testament, are passed over without comment, though an examination of the subject at large had been promised in the notes to the sixth chapter. Note 8. sect. 10.

perfect one, the defects of which were supplied by the editor from Greek and Latin copies.*

Griesbach has taken much greater pains in reference to the Alexandrine, than to the Western recension. The former constitutes, as Dr. Laurence remarks, the main pin which holds together the complicated machinery of his system. Its existence, therefore, as a specific text, different from both the Western and the Eastern, should be previously proved. That its existence has not been proved is the opinion of Dr. Laurence, whose remarks are principally directed against Griesbach's statements on this point.

In his "*Curæ in Epistolas Paulinas*," published in 1777, Griesbach suggests that the number of recensions should be confined to five or six, and that each recension might be divided into two or more subdivisions, according to the affinities of the manuscripts included in each general class. In an edition of the Gospels, published in the same year, he states that the 'only true way' of proceeding with confidence and accuracy, is to ascertain the number, antiquity, and value, of these five, or six recensions, and then to refer every manuscript to its appropriate text, but that he was compelled, from the extreme intricacy and difficulty of the undertaking, to seek another path. Dr. Laurence, therefore, first objects to Griesbach's classification of Greek manuscripts, that while he admits the propriety of a more extended division, and supposes the existence of five or six classes, he confines himself exclusively to the threefold division of an Alexandrine, a Western, and a Byzantine text.

'How,' he asks, 'can we confidently determine the exact classification of a manuscript, when we have professedly omitted to take into our computation two, or perhaps three texts, the existence of which we admit, but with the character of which we are unacquainted?'—p. 22.

To this objection great weight must be allowed. If the different classes, into which Greek manuscripts might be divided, be assumed as the basis of a system by which the text is to be re-modelled, the whole number of classes ought undoubtedly to be employed, since the omission of a single class may lead to the most serious errors. If it be asserted, that although we possess not sufficient data to discover the precise text from which a manuscript was indisputably derived, it is, at least, of some importance, that we are enabled to ascertain its proximate relation to one out of three texts;—Dr. Laurence replies, that 'the prox-

* Marsh's Michaelis, Vol. II. pt. 2. ch. 7. sect. 17. note 7.

manuscript cannot be correctly represented as the real affinity of a manuscript ;' and he argues in the following manner.

The Alexandrine and Western recensions have, according to Griesbach, many readings in common ; on the supposition, therefore, that a manuscript had one hundred readings common to both texts, besides fifty more peculiar to the Alexandrine, he would immediately pronounce it to be of the Alexandrine class. But put the case that a hundred readings were lost from the Alexandrine, (and greater losses are presumed have happened) the manuscript in question would then be reckoned of the Western class, since it would possess a hundred readings of that recension, and only fifty of the Alexandrine.'—'If such a result accrue from a deficiency in our knowledge of a part of a text, less surely cannot be attributable to a deficiency in our knowledge of a whole one ; and not of one only, but of two, or even three.' pp. 23—25.

In deciding upon the classification of a manuscript, Dr. Laurence remarks, p. 27, Griesbach is guided by its *various readings* or departure from the received text. *These* he compares with what he conceives to be the various readings of the other texts, namely, the Alexandrine and the Western, and in whichever of the two he finds the sum of the agreements to exceed the sum of the differences, to that he assigns it. If the readings are few, and not generally coincident with either, it remains with the Byzantine. He assumes the readings of Origen as an exemplar of the Alexandrine recension ; and if the major part of the various readings, in any given manuscript, accord with the text of Origen, where it differs from the received text, it is reckoned Alexandrine. Thus he says of the Codex L :—' *Ex incredibili hoc codicis nostri cum venerandis illis exemplaribus, quæ Origenes olim suis manibus versavit, consensu manifestum fiet libri nostri præstantia insignis.*' *Symbolæ. Vol. I. p. 76.*

The manuscript A he represents as belonging to the Alexandrine class, because out of one hundred and seventy various readings, it agrees with Origen one hundred and ten times, and differs from him only sixty times. The manuscript C, or Codex Ephrem also, he reckons Alexandrine, because out of one hundred and sixteen differences from the received text, it agrees with Origen ninety-six times, and differs from him only twenty times.

The various readings of a manuscript in its departure from the received text, Dr. L. remarks, might afford the surest basis for a classification, were the received to be considered as the *standard text*, with which all manuscripts generally accorded, but from which they occasionally, and only occasionally, deviated. The character of such occasional deviations would then seem to form the sole object of investigation. But as Griesbach allows not the existence of any standard text, and argues that the re-

14 Laurence on Griesbach's Classification of MSS.

ceived, as principally conformable to the Byzantine, is the w of the three, he ought not to have adopted the common practice of solely contemplating in manuscripts their variations from the received text, because the object of his research simply appears to have been *not the character of particular deviations from any individual text, but the general coincidences of manuscript with one text above another*. Dr. Laurence therefore contends that the result of Griesbach's calculation would have been very different, had he limited his observation to the various readings of another text instead of the Byzantine, and makes the following experiment with the Alexandrine as exhibited in the readings of Origen.

The manuscript A, as compared with the received text, has one hundred and seventy deviations, in one hundred and ten which it agrees with the Alexandrine text, or the quotations of Origen, and differs from it in sixty. On this calculation it belongs to the Alexandrine class. But compare the same manuscript with the Alexandrine text, or the quotations of Origen, and it will then rank under the Byzantine. For the deviations of A from Origen are one hundred and fifty-six: including sixty differences both from Origen and the received text, and ninety-six from Origen alone where it agrees with the received text—and out of these it is evident that it agrees with the received text when it differs from Origen ninety-six times, and dissents from it only sixty times. In the same manner will the Codex Ephraemi change sides if tried by the same standard. It is pronounced Alexandrine, because out of one hundred and sixteen variations from the received text, it accords ninety-six times with Origen and differs from him only in twenty instances. But take the Alexandrine text as the standard, the Ephrem MS. has then one hundred and sixteen deviations from Origen; (twenty in which it dissents both from Origen and from the received text, and ninety six more in which, in common with A, and agreeing with the received text, it differs from Origen;) and of these, one hundred and sixteen, twenty differ from the Byzantine, and ninety-six agree with it: the very proportion of readings which in the former case, arranged it under the Alexandrine, but which now assigns it to the Byzantine text.

The reader will observe that Griesbach balances the agreements of a manuscript with the Alexandrine text, (for which he adopts Origen's readings,) against its disagreements with the same text, exclusive of its coincidences with the received text. It is the assumption of these into the calculations of Dr. Laurence, which operates the change in the compared manuscripts from one class to another. This process appears to be accurate in its principle, since the agreements of a manuscript with the

received text are its differences from the exemplar with which it is compared as often as it is found to deviate from that text. If A be compared with Origen, it is not only the readings of the former which differ from the received text that must be compared, but also its readings which are in accordance with the received text where Origen differs from it. This mode of calculation is exemplified by Dr. Laurence as follows: A has ninety-six readings differing from one text alone, (the Alexandrine or Origen,) and sixty differing from both texts (the received and Origen). These numbers combined, make one-hundred and fifty-six readings, which, opposed to the one-hundred and ten agreements, leave a balance of forty-six against the union with Origen: not forty as Dr. Laurence by a singular oversight sets down. C has ninety-six readings differing from one text alone, (Origen's,) and twenty differing from both texts, which together make one-hundred and sixteen readings; and these opposed to the ninety-six agreements of C with Origen, leave a balance of twenty against the union with the latter. 'Thus, upon ground which Griesbach himself considers as at least fairly admissible, he experiences another failure in the exemplification of his theory.' p. 37.

Dr. Laurence now takes different ground in his examination of Griesbach, and affirms that his calculations are too inaccurate to claim our confidence. He does not impeach his fidelity, but he more than suspects him of inadvertence, and produces evidence in support of his charge that the errors of Griesbach are numerous and important.

In the first volume of the *Symbolæ Criticæ*, p. 134. Griesbach compares the manuscripts A C with Origen in the Epistles of Paul, and gives the following numbers as the result: 'Codicibus A C conspirant inter se 88^{ies}. Inter lectiones illas 88 codicibus A et C communes, sunt 75, quibus suffragatur Origines, et 13 tantum a quibus abhorret.' But here, says his learned examiner, he is indisputably inaccurate. 'Instead of only thirteen instances of discordance he should have given thirty.' The additional seventeen discrepancies are inserted in a note, p. 38. Dr. Laurence, however, is himself inaccurate in this list: he includes in the number of his own readings, 1 Cor. ix, 20 + *μη εν αυτος υπο νομον*, which is one of the thirteen quoted by Griesbach. On the omission of the article *αι* before *ο διαθηκαι*, Gal. iv. 24, by Griesbach Dr. Laurence thus comments.

'In the first edition of his Testament he says=A, C, D, E, F, G, &c. Orig. In the last edition it stands thus:=A, B, C, D, E, F, G, &c. Orig. MS. but in his published quotations of Origen he marks no variation at all from the received text. Now it seems that in his

first edition he rested his assertion of the omission of *αι* by Origen upon the authority of Wetstein, whose words are, "Origenes contra Celsum, p. 193." but, upon turning to the passage in Spencer's edition which Wetstein used, we nevertheless find *αι* inserted in the text. Before his second edition, we may presume, from the words Orig. MS. that he more fully investigated the fact, and discovered that it was at least wanting in manuscripts. This we may presume, but the very reverse is the truth: for the passage is not only found in the edition of Origen which he used with *αι* as he himself correctly quotes the verse in the *Symbolæ*, but a note is also added by the editors expressly stating that although Tarinus omits it, it nevertheless occurs in manuscripts; "apud Tarinum desunt *αι* duo, quæ habentur in MSS." How could a writer of Griesbach's talent and diligence blunder so egregiously! pp. 42, 44.

Is the existence of *αι* in some manuscripts of Origen a proof of its being in all the manuscripts? And if it be wanting in some MSS. is not Griesbach's statement correct? The reading, it is true, stands in the text of Spencer's edition, but included in parentheses as of doubtful authority, and this fact should have been stated by Dr. Laurence. Griesbach omits *και* 1 Cor. iii. 2. and gives the same reading in the *Symbolæ* but in the text of Spencer's Origen, p. 143, it is included in parentheses [*και*]. So is *του* before *θεου* Rom. xiii. 1.—So is *εξουσια* in the same verse, which Griesbach very properly marks = apud Wetstein, who considered them as omissible in the text of Origen on manuscript authority. We do not offer these observations in complete exculpation of Griesbach's omitting the article, which probably is part of Origen's genuine text and which we find quoted in the *Philocalia*, as well as in the places already mentioned; but for the purpose of tempering his remarker's censure, who appears to us too peremptorily to pronounce the very reverse of the supposition in favour of Griesbach to be the truth.

Under the persuasion of the inaccuracy of Griesbach's calculations, Dr. Laurence has himself compared the various readings of the manuscript A with the text of Origen published in the second volume of the *Symbolæ*, and has inserted them together with other readings in illustration of his argument, in an appendix. Instead of one hundred and ten agreements between A and Origen, in their deviations from the received text, he reckons one hundred and fifty-four, and computes their disagreements at one hundred and forty, instead of sixty, the amount according to Griesbach, whose mode of calculation will then determine the class of the manuscript A by the excess of fourteen Alexandrine readings. Dr. Laurence further reckons the agreements of A with the received text, where they differ from Origen, to be four hundred and forty-four:—from which

if the one hundred and forty disagreements be deducted, an excess of three hundred and four will prove the manuscript to be of the Byzantine class.

‘The difference,’ Dr. L. remarks, ‘between the amount of my enumeration and that of Griesbach, particularly in the passages where Origen reads alone in opposition both to the manuscript A and the received text, is remarkable. It is the more so because he professes to have carefully marked the variations of Origen.’ p. 47.

Immediately afterwards however he observes, that his numbers are necessarily somewhat larger than Griesbach's, because he has not omitted, as the former has done, the consideration of passages in which C, as well as A and Origen, is defective. In these passages no fewer than one hundred and forty-six readings peculiar to Origen are included; the number of readings in which A and Origen agree within the same limits is forty-two. Had Dr. Laurence therefore omitted the passages in A and Origen, where C is defective, his computation would have been two hundred and ninety-eight readings in which Origen differs from both the manuscript A and the received text: and the number of readings common to A and Origen, where they both depart from the received text, would have been one hundred and twelve, exceeding Griesbach's computation in this latter instance by only two! A strong presumption in favour of Griesbach's accuracy.

The most remarkable circumstance in the differences between Griesbach's and Dr. Laurence's enumeration, is found in their respective statements of the readings of Origen, where he differs from both the manuscript A and the received text. Griesbach states the various readings of Origen, where A and C agree with the received text to be ninety-six. Dr. Laurence reckons the various readings of Origen at four hundred and forty-four, or at two hundred and ninety-eight where his limits are the same as Griesbach's. Out of the ninety-six readings Griesbach includes only thirty-nine inconstant, making the constant fifty-seven. Dr. Laurence's computations present a considerable majority of inconstant readings, which are two hundred and forty-five to one hundred and ninety-nine constant. Are we then to suppose that Griesbach, in computing the readings of Origen, is in an error of two hundred and two readings, the difference between his number and Dr. Laurence's? If he could commit mistakes in this manner, all confidence in his statements must be annihilated. When therefore he reckons only ninety-six readings of Origen, where Dr. Laurence computes two hundred and ninety-eight, the difference must be attributed to the different modes of computation adopted by these critics; and

is evidently to be found in the latter's reckoning the whole of Origen's variations, while the former includes only what he accounted characteristic readings. The question is still to be decided to what extent the readings of Origen are to be adopted by the critic as an exemplar of the Alexandrine text, if such a text exist, and as a test of Greek manuscript. We shall advert to this question in the sequel.

Having endeavoured to prove that Griesbach's mode of investigation is inaccurate and unsatisfactory, Dr. Laurence proceeds to detail what he conceives to be a more correct mode of ascertaining the relative classification of a manuscript. The object, he observes, simply seems to be, to determine with which out of three texts a manuscript has the greatest conformity, and thus he thinks can only be effected, not by considering the character of its deviations from one particular text, but the separate sums of its agreements, or disagreements with all three, each contrasted with the other;—as in the following examples, the first of which assumes the numbers of Griesbach.

A agrees with Origen in opposition to the Byzantine text one hundred and ten times. A agrees with the Byzantine text in opposition to Origen ninety-six times. The difference therefore is fourteen readings in favour of Origen or the Alexandrine text. Such is the result of the agreements. With respect to the disagreements an inverse mode of calculation must be pursued. The deviations of A with Origen from the Byzantine text are one hundred and ten. Its deviations from both Origen and the Byzantine text are sixty, which together make one hundred and seventy, the disagreements of A with the Byzantine text. The deviations of A with the Byzantine text from Origen are ninety-six, which added to the sixty deviations of A from both texts make one hundred and fifty-six, the disagreements of A with Origen or the Alexandrine text. One hundred and fifty-six taken from one hundred and seventy leave a remainder of fourteen, exactly as in the former case, and thus the agreements and disagreements give the same result.

‘Plain and simple as this species of elucidation seems to be,’ Dr. Laurence remarks, ‘it nevertheless escaped the penetrating eye of Griesbach, who, too much dazzled perhaps by the splendour of intricate and perplexing research, over-looked what lay immediately before him. When he threw his critical bowl among the established theories of his predecessors, he too hastily attempted to set up his own, without having first totally demolished theirs; forgetting that the very nerve of his criticism was a principle of hostility to every standard text.’ p. 36.

We would not willingly misconstrue a writer's words, but

we are not sure that the manner in which 'standard text' is mentioned by the learned Author in this work may not be considered by some of its readers as attaching that character to the received text. Dr. Laurence himself is too sound a scholar to sanction that notion: we intend the remark, not for him, but for his readers. The foregoing extract will convince some of our readers that he has exposed himself to animadversions not only by the style of his censure, but by the assumptions which he has introduced. To what 'established theories,' might a disciple of Griesbach inquire, does Dr. Laurence refer?

As an excess of fourteen readings assigns the manuscript A, on the preceding mode of comparison, to the Alexandrine class, in which, according to Griesbach, it ranks, Dr. L. remarks that he is not contending for the alliance of A to one class in preference to another, but solely for the true method of classification; and that possibly a more accurate investigation of readings may produce a greater difference in the result of their respective calculations. His next object therefore is to ascertain the truth of this statement.

Rejecting the numbers of Griesbach as inaccurate, his learned examiner proceeds to consider the admittances of A, first with the Byzantine and the Alexandrine texts, and subsequently with the Byzantine and the Western; according to the numbers in his own Appendix, in illustration of the proposed mode of comparison, including both the agreements and disagreements of the manuscript. The manuscript A agrees with the received text in opposition to Origen or the Alexandrine text four hundred and forty-four times. The agreements of A with Origen, where the Byzantine reads alone, are one hundred and fifty-four, which constitute *the agreements of A with the Alexandrine text*. The latter amount deducted from the former leaves two hundred and ninety readings in favour of the agreement of A with the Byzantine text.—The result of the disagreements is as follows: A in conjunction with the Byzantine text deviates from Origen four hundred and forty-four times; A also deviates from both the Byzantine text and Origen one hundred and forty times, which make the *disagreements of A with the Alexandrine text or Origen five hundred and eighty-four*.

After a similar mode the deviations of A in union with Origen, from the Byzantine text, are one hundred and fifty-four, to which, if the deviations of A from both texts, stated at one hundred and forty, be subjoined, the amount will be two hundred and ninety-four, and these form *the disagreements of A with the Byzantine text*; which deducted from five hundred and eighty-four, the disagreements of A with the Alexandrine text, leave two hundred and ninety, as in the case of the agreements, in favour of *the agreement of A with the Byzantine*.

is evidently to be found in the latter's reckoning the whole of Origen's variations, while the former includes only what he accounted characteristic readings. The question is still to be decided to what extent the readings of Origen are to be adopted by the critic as an exemplar of the Alexandrine text, if such a text exist, and as a test of Greek manuscript. We shall advert to this question in the sequel.

Having endeavoured to prove that Griesbach's mode of investigation is inaccurate and unsatisfactory, Dr. Laurence proceeds to detail what he conceives to be a more correct mode of ascertaining the relative classification of a manuscript. The object, he observes, simply seems to be, to determine with which out of three texts a manuscript has the greatest conformity, and this he thinks can only be effected, not by considering *the character of its deviations from one particular text, but the separate sums of its agreements, or disagreements with all three, each contrasted with the other*;—as in the following examples, the first of which assumes the numbers of Griesbach.

A agrees with Origen in opposition to the Byzantine text one hundred and ten times. A agrees with the Byzantine text in opposition to Origen ninety-six times. The difference therefore is *fourteen* readings in favour of Origen or the Alexandrine text. Such is the result of the *agreements*. With respect to the disagreements an inverse mode of calculation must be pursued. The deviations of A with Origen from the Byzantine text are one hundred and ten. Its deviations from both Origen and the Byzantine text are sixty, which together make one hundred and seventy, *the disagreements of A with the Byzantine text*. The deviations of A with the Byzantine text from Origen are ninety-six, which added to the sixty deviations of A from both texts make one hundred and fifty-six, *the disagreements of A with Origen or the Alexandrine text*. One hundred and fifty-six taken from one hundred and seventy leave a remainder of fourteen, exactly as in the former case, and thus the agreements and disagreements give the same result.

‘ Plain and simple as this species of elucidation seems to be,’ Dr. Laurence remarks, ‘ it nevertheless escaped the penetrating eye of Griesbach, who, too much dazzled perhaps by the splendour of intricate and perplexing research, over-looked what lay immediately before him. When he threw his critical bowl among the established theories of his predecessors, he too hastily attempted to set up his own, without having first totally demolished theirs; forgetting that the very nerve of his criticism was a principle of hostility to every standard text.’ p. 56.

We would not willingly misconstrue a writer's words, but

we are not sure that the manner in which 'standard text' is mentioned by the learned Author in this work may not be considered by some of its readers as attaching that character to the received text. Dr. Laurence himself is too sound a scholar to sanction that notion: we intend the remark, not for him, but for his readers. The foregoing extract will convince some of our readers that he has exposed himself to animadversions not only by the style of his censure, but by the assumptions which he has introduced. To what '*established theories*,' might a disciple of Griesbach inquire, does Dr. Laurence refer?

As an excess of fourteen readings assigns the manuscript A, on the preceding mode of comparison, to the Alexandrine class, in which, according to Griesbach, it ranks, Dr. L. remarks that he is not contending for the alliance of A to one class in preference to another, but solely for the true method of classification; and that possibly a more accurate investigation of readings may produce a greater difference in the result of their respective calculations. His next object therefore is to ascertain the truth of this statement.

Rejecting the numbers of Griesbach as inaccurate, his learned examiner proceeds to consider the affinities of A, first with the Byzantine and the Alexandrine texts, and subsequently with the Byzantine and the Western; according to the numbers in his own Appendix, in illustration of the proposed mode of comparison, including both the agreements and disagreements of the manuscript. The manuscript A agrees with the received text in opposition to Origen or the Alexandrine text four hundred and forty-four times. The agreements of A with Origen, where the Byzantine reads alone, are one hundred and fifty-four, which constitute *the agreements of A with the Alexandrine text*. The latter amount deducted from the former leaves two hundred and ninety readings *in favour of the agreement of A with the Byzantine text*.—The result of the disagreements is as follows: A in conjunction with the Byzantine text deviates from Origen four hundred and forty-four times: A also deviates from both the Byzantine text and Origen one hundred and forty times, which make the *disagreements of A with the Alexandrine text or Origen five hundred and eighty-four*.

After a similar mode the deviations of A in union with Origen, from the Byzantine text, are one hundred and fifty-four, to which, if the deviations of A from both texts, stated at one hundred and forty, be subjoined, the amount will be two hundred and ninety-four, and these form *the disagreements of A with the Byzantine text*; which deducted from five hundred and eighty-four, the disagreements of A with the Alexandrine text, leave two hundred and ninety, as in the case of the agreements; in favour of *the agreement of A with the Byzantine*.

The alliance of the manuscript A to the Byzantine text, being thus established on a comparison with the Alexandrine and the Byzantine texts, Dr. Laurence next investigates its affinity, on a comparison with the Byzantine and the Western texts; taking as an exemplar of the latter the Codex Boernerianus, or manuscript G, which was published by Matthaei, at Meissen, in Saxony, in 1791; and gives the following results. The agreements of A with the Byzantine text, in opposition to G or the Western, are two hundred and eighty: the agreements of A with G, or the Western text, in opposition to the Byzantine, are one hundred and twenty-three; which sum subtracted from the preceding, leaves one hundred and fifty-seven in support of the *alliance of A to the Byzantine*. Upon a similar computation of the disagreements, the deviations of A in conjunction with the Byzantine text from G, or the Western, amounting to two hundred and eighty, being added to the deviations of A from both, stated at one hundred and sixty-nine, make together four hundred and forty-nine. So also on the other side, A with G deviates from the Byzantine one hundred and twenty-three times, to which, if the deviations of A from both—one hundred and sixty-nine—be added, the amount will be two hundred and ninety-two, which deducted from four hundred and forty-nine, leaves a remainder of one hundred and fifty-seven *against the affinity of A to G*. From these remarks it appears that the affinity of the manuscript A is much greater to the Byzantine text, than either to the Western, or to the Alexandrine.

Dr. Laurence flatters himself that error does not often, if at all occur in his own case. In this supposition however he is mistaken. His errors are numerous, and that they may furnish the occasion of greater care in future collators, we shall point them out.

In animadverting on Griesbach, p. 41. for improperly attributing the reading $\tau\alpha$ 1 Cor. ii. 15. to the manuscript G. Dr. Laurence himself furnishes an instance of the same mode of erring in his own citation from Griesbach, who does not quote the manuscript E in the list of authorities for that addition. P. 42. 7 instead of 17, is put with A D E F; and 1 Cor. vii. 13. instead of 1 Cor. vii. 32. Several other errors of the same kind occur in the Appendix; for example, p. 98. $\tau\alpha$ 1 Col. i. 16. should be $\tau\alpha$. Ibid. ii. 11 $\tau\eta\mu\omega\nu$ not $\tau\eta\mu\omega\nu$. P. 109. 1 Cor. x. 1. 80 is put for 74, al. 6 instead of 6, and Hilary should be omitted. P. 112. Rom. ii. 5. $\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\pi\omicron\delta\omega\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ is the reading of the Codex Alexandrinus, not $\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\pi\omicron\delta\omega\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$. This error occurs also in p. 68. The following errors are more important.

Page 95. $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ Rom. v. 17. is reckoned twice, constant and inconstant: so is $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$ Rom. ix. 12. so is $\kappa\alpha\theta\alpha\pi\epsilon\rho$. *ibid.* ix. 13. and $\delta\epsilon'$ *αυτου* Coloss. i. 20. $\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ *πλουσιως* 1 Tim. vi. 17. is

also reckoned twice, pp. 98, 106. 1 Cor. xiv. 8. (p. 97.) παρασκευάζεται should be transferred to the agreements of A with Origen. 2 Cor. xii. 7. p. 101. καλαφιση should not have been reckoned, as the last two letters are wanting in the manuscript A, which makes its reading uncertain in this place. Besides these errors in the extracts from Origen, there are four readings p. 96. which should not have been inserted, as those verses are wanting in A. 1 Cor. vi. 3. + ἡ. ibid. 4. ἐξουθενωμενους for ἐξουθενημενους: ix. 2. + και. ibid. μου της for της εμης.

The following instances of agreement in A, C, and Origen, and of A with Origen, unnoticed by Dr. Laurence, will shew how imperfectly he has collated his authorities.

Rom. vii. 3. + γυνη after χρηματισει. A unnoticed by Griesbach, and strangely included by Dr. Laurence in the readings of A alone. P. 112. Rom. viii. 11. = και A, 39, 47. unnoticed by Griesbach. xii. 19. εκδικησεις for εκδικησις. A unnoticed by Griesbach. 1 Cor. v. 8. εορταζομεν for εορταζωμεν. A D E unnoticed by Griesbach. vi. 16. = φησιν. A. Epiph. Cyr. Ambr. unnoticed by Griesbach. vii. 34. τῷ σωματι και τῷ πνευματι for σωματι και πνευματι. A unnoticed by Griesbach. ix. 21. χριστου for χριστω, A B C D E F G. x. 4. πνευματικον ἐπιον πομα for πομα πνευματικον ἐπιον unnoticed by Griesbach. xiii. 11. = δε. A B D 67. Ambrst. unnoticed by Griesbach. xiv. 8. παρασκευάζεται for παρασκευάζεται. A. unnoticed by Griesbach. 1 Cor. xv. 19. εν χριστω ηλπικοτες εσμεν for ηλπικοτες εσμεν εν χριστω. A B D E F G, 17, 31, 37. Theop. Iren. Ambrst. noticed by Dr. Laurence in the agreements of A with G. Ibid. 28. = τα before the last παντα A. 2 Cor. ii. 16. + εκ A C, occurs twice, reckoned only once by Dr. Laurence. Eph. iii. 6. = τῷ before χριστω. A. Philip. ii. 5. = γαρ A B C, 17, 37. unnoticed by Griesbach. Coloss. ii. 2. = των αμαρτιων. 2 Thess. ii. 4. αποδεικνυντα for αποδεικνυντα. A F G. 1 Tim. i. 1. = κυριου. A D F G, 17, 31, 38. Vulg. Ambr. unnoticed by Griesbach. Ibid. ix. τας is given in the deviations of Origen, p. 103. it is also wanting in A.

In the derivations of the manuscript A. p. 112. there are the following errors. Rom. vii. 3. + ἡ γυνη (not ἡ before γυνη as Dr. Laurence by mistake inserts it. 1 Cor. v. 8. εορταζομεν. 1 Tim. i. 1. = κυριου. belong to the agreements of A with Origen. 1 Cor. viii. 6. ὑμιν for ἡμιν, and xv. 23. = του should not have been reckoned, as A agrees with the received text in those readings. These with 1 Cor. ix. 20. already noticed in the differences of A C from Origen, make six instances to be deducted from one hundred and forty, the deviations of A from Origen according to Dr. Laurence's computation—they will then be one hundred and thirty-four. To the agreements of A with Origen, reckoned by him to be one hundred and fifty-four, the above nineteen are to be added, making the number one hundred and seventy-

three. From the deviations of Origen, which he calculates at four hundred and forty four, eleven are to be deducted, which reduces the number to four hundred and thirty three;—but as Dr. Laurence adopts in his comparisons the number of readings as stated, p. 103, which are four hundred and forty four, excluding the larger number four hundred and fifty five, as it appears in p. 104, our corrections will leave the former as the sum. We have still to add, that in the deviations of Origen, Dr. Laurence's reckonings are strangely incorrect, as he has omitted many readings which occur in the second volume of the *Symbolæ*, which he professes to have very carefully collated. He informs us that he has given all the readings of Origen which a diligent investigation enabled him to discover in the Epistles of Paul. We have gone over the same ground, and can assure him that the omissions in his catalogue are not a few. In censuring Griesbach for his want of correctness, Dr. Laurence remarks that accuracy of collation, where it is easily obtainable, may be expected. In another part of his work, however, he very properly observes, that the extreme toil and irksomeness of making extracts of this kind, are apt to confuse the eye, and weary the mind, and that in so dry and dull an investigation, error, perhaps, is more or less unavoidable. If the benefit of these remarks be conceded to Griesbach, we are equally willing to allow it to his examiner, whose numerous errors in so limited a portion of the critical field, furnish a better apology for Griesbach, than any which we might elaborate on his behalf.

(To be concluded in our next Number.)

Art. II. *Voyage dans le Nord de l'Europe*; consistant principalement de Promenades en Norwège, et de quelques Courses en Suède, dans l'Année MDCCCVII. Avec une Relation Descriptive des Costumés et Manières des Natifs, et des Sites extraordinaires de la Contrée. Suivi d'un Appendice, contenant des Remarques historiques et physiques, &c. &c. &c. et des Itinéraires du Pays. Par A. Lamotte. Avec des Planches, et une Carte de Norwège, &c. 4to. pp. 244. Prix 2l. 2s. Hatchard. 1813*.

NORWAY is the principal subject, as the title expresses, of this elegant volume; since the publication of which, a little affair has occurred relatively to that country, or to its inha-

* There has appeared a second edition, in octavo, price 15s. We presume it contains all the plates. The price of the 4to. is rather exorbitant, even allowing for the beauty of those plates.

bitants; an affair which, indeed, could not, half a century since, have been spoken of in such diminutive terms without exciting considerable surprise in the hearer. The country with its people, or the people with its country, taken either way a perfectly traffickable property, has been transferred entire, in fee simple, to a new owner. This acquirer was detested by the human portion of his bargain; there was a war about the matter; but the combination of force, skill, treachery, and starvation, soon put it practically out of controversy; it ended with some nauseous cajolery at taking possession; the friends of justice had a very short allowance of time to deplore and execrate, before other subjects presented themselves to draw their indignation; and now the whole transaction is nearly gone from remembrance. Such are the times in which we live.

“What thou doest do quickly.” The period is, by the magnitude of its iniquities, and by the oblivion of each at the prompt appearance of the next, so incomparably auspicious to all those perpetrations which would be the most obnoxious to infamy in less disordered times, that it will be policy in such schemers of evil, on the great scale or the small, as would deprecate being the objects of the marked and protracted reprobation of their contemporaries, to take advantage of the season, and hasten the execution of their designs—unless indeed they judge there is little cause to fear any such slackening in the rapidity of the succession of odious transactions, as to give time for attention and detestation to fix long on theirs.

The country had enjoyed, at the time of our Author's visit, a very long period of tranquillity; and it was chiefly because the rest of Europe was not then in that state that the excursion took this northerly direction. Two young Oxonians, —Sir Thomas Ackland and another gentleman, had profited so much by the discipline of the college, as to be judged capable of reaping a wider field of instruction than the breadth of England could furnish; and Mr. Lamotte, a French gentleman who had resided many years, and obtained letters of naturalization, in England, received applications, conveyed, it seems, in the most flattering style of politeness, from the respective families, soliciting him to undertake the office of Mentor to the two young gentlemen during their foreign movements, but with what precise degree of authority over them is not stated. However that matter might be, it should seem he found no cause of complaint against them. He reports their behaviour as exemplary; and he was peculiarly gratified by the ability and activity of Sir T. Ackland, who, among other accomplishments, was qualified for the department of draughtsman, while the office of historian devolved on Mr. Lamotte him-

self. The reason assigned for writing in French is, that as the story was to be rather of a spritely cast, he could not hope to command, in an acquired language, the easy vivacity of diction appropriate to such a work, so well as in his native tongue.

The journal begins at Gottenburgh, 7th July, 1807, with due notices of locality, mode of building, and the character and customs of the people. The first important point, for the better or the worse, in travelling experience, being the quality of the mode of conveyance, there can be no objection to our Author's informing all such as may be inclined to follow his route, that

‘Whoever travels in the North must not expect to find post-chaises, or diligences of any kind; he must be contented with the wretched calashes of the country, unless he rather chooses to go on foot, or to purchase a voiture and hire a driver. In this last case he will do well to provide himself also with harness, as that supplied by the country people, who furnish the horses, consists of nothing but ropes, or ends of rope.’

This is followed by a rather long account of the rules and manœuvres of these honest country folk in the management both of their horses and of the persons whom they undertake to convey. From the whole description it is easy to see, as Mr. L. remarks, that ‘posting in the North is on a footing ‘comparatively barbarous; and that a stranger, who does not ‘understand the language of the country is exposed to all kinds ‘of mistakes and frauds.’

The first very striking object presented to view, was at Trollhattan, where many other travellers have beheld with wonder that prodigious work of human art and labour, the canal, or rather the succession of locks, by means of which a navigable communication has been effected between lake Wenner and Gottenburgh; and have contemplated the cataracts of the Gothen in perhaps a somewhat more elevated tone of sentiment than that which prevails in the following description.

‘The effect of these cataracts must be admirable in the eyes of an amateur or an artist. In mine that effect was the change, by the mighty tumult of the aqueous particles of water into the appearance of milk, violently boiling. To use another simile, I seemed to see water, calm and greenish above the fall, transformed into a torrent of white salt, or of sugar impetuously agitated.’

The small but exquisite engraving, inserted at this description, will help the reader to more appropriate imaginations.

As little time, and less fancy, are wasted on another and still more magnificent cataract, mentioned a few pages further on.

'Half way on the road from Frederickshald to Moss, we saw the great cataract of Halslund, the most considerable perhaps in Europe. The Glomme, which in this place has a mass of water equal to that of the Thames at Westminster Bridge, or to that of Seine at Rouen, is not superior—the Glomme, I say, precipitates its whitened waters over frightful rocks to a depth of sixty or seventy feet. It works a number of saw-mills, and a curious clock in a pavillion belonging to the chamberlain, Mr. Rosenkrantz.'

We may notice, as a sample of one of the available means for fabricating an elegant and costly volume, that this little paragraph, and just as many lines more, are absolutely, with the exception of a few words marking a division of book and chapter, the whole of the printing contained in five and a half quarto pages; and this occurs in the body of the book.

In approaching the pass of Swinsund, where Sweden terminates and Norway begins, our Author was a good deal oppressed by the sensations which invaded him from the wildness and dreariness of the scene through which he was passing, rendered doubly gloomy by the shades of night, this gloom being still aggravated by that formidable something which he says is always included in the idea of a frontier. There is no saying what his alarmed emotions might have grown to, had they not been suddenly and opportunely relieved by the question, in English, 'Gentlemen, what news in England?' from a person who presented himself in the road before our travellers. When, after going a little way forward, they found this inquirer's cabriolet occupied by a lady, Mr. L. was, he confesses, ashamed of his apprehensions. It is natural, at least to many constitutions, for a sudden deliverance from terror to be followed, after an interval, by an ebullition of spirits, mounting in gaiety, or heroic purpose, or eloquent sentiment, as the case may be. Is it to this fine post-re-action that we owe the ambitious apostrophe to Norway into which Mr. L. goes off on finding himself safe over 'le terme fatal,' as he denominates the narrow inlet of sea which divides the countries, and did then separate two kingdoms?

At Frederickshald he was considerably interested in visiting the humble monument, a thick wooden cross, raised on the spot where a memorable fire-brand was put out, in the death of Charles XII. But he does not pretend to any emotions at all comparable to the reverence or enthusiasm of Sir Sidney Smith, whom he represents to have 'prostrated himself at the fatal spot, from an impulse of heroic sympathy, and kissed the ground.' There had been some sense in such an action if the emotion had been that of gratitude to the earth for having taken the hero from above ground to below.

In the first few stages of their journey the travellers had repeated occasions to observe the remains of towns which had been burnt down, and to wish therefore that other materials than wood might be employed in building. At Christiania indeed they found the houses chiefly of brick. This city is the capital of one of the four provinces into which Norway is divided. They found it a handsome place, well stored with luxuries, but just at that season suffering almost the heat of the torrid zone. They soon got among the best things and people; and there is a really curious detail of the changing subjects and scenes of operation of a grand dinner party, at the country house of an opulent citizen, where they maintained the action with wonderful resolution till ten o'clock at night, when, as 'one gets tired, at last, of every thing,' says Mr. L., 'even of pleasure,' they took their leave, in grateful admiration of their hosts and their entertainment.

In a visit to the Military Institution their attention was particularly excited by an article not found in the ordinary apparatus of war, a kind of wooden skates, of which the one for the left foot, is from eight to ten feet long and three or four inches broad; the one for the right foot is only about three (another account says six) feet long. Mr. Lamotte says, there is a regiment of chasseurs, numbering nearly a thousand men trained to the use of these skates or pattens, and that in certain circumstances they would be almost irresistible.

'Cavalry,' he says, 'could neither pursue them nor escape their pursuit; and as they are sharp shooters they might in the long run destroy the whole of an invading force, however numerous it might be. It was chiefly owing to them that the Swedish army, sent, in 1718, by Charles XII, against Drontheim, in the month of December, was so obstructed in its march as to be reduced to perish in the snow.'

He gives in the Appendix, as an extract from a northern periodical paper, a more particular account of the equipment and mode of individual operations of the *Skjelöber-Corps*, or *Corps des Patineurs*, operations however which can seldom have any object more martial than the pursuit of game.

'Figure to yourselves a pair of boards, each of the breadth of the hand, and hardly the thickness of the little finger; a little hollowed along the middle on the side toward the ground, to prevent wavering, and to cut a straight line. Both are bent upward at the ends, a little higher before than behind. They are bound on the feet with two straps, passed through them at the middle, where the wood is left a little higher and thicker for this purpose. The board for the right foot has often a facing of rein deer or sea dog skin; the advantage of which is, that in bringing forward the feet alternately and in parallel lines, the skater can give himself a strong impetus on the right foot,

by means of the hold which the hair of this skin has on the snow, as, though perfectly slippery in going the right way, it is roughened and resists in any inclination of the skate to an opposite movement.

It is affirmed that a practised skater can go, as soon as the snow is a little hardened, faster and for a longer time even on a level ground than the best horse trotting on the best road. But in descending a mountain, he darts with such a velocity, that he would absolutely lose his breath if he did not endeavour to moderate his flight. He ascends with comparative slowness and some difficulty, as he is obliged to go zig-zag; but nevertheless he reaches the top as soon as the best footman.

He has the advantage besides, that however little firmness the snow may have acquired, he cannot sink.

The arms (of this regular corps) are, a carbine held by a thong which passes over the shoulder, a large hunting knife, and a staff, three ells and a half long, and an inch and a quarter in diameter, pointed with iron, and set in iron to some small distance upward from the point. This last serves chiefly to check the rapidity of a descent; the skater then puts it between his feet, and so drags it, or he drags it by his side: he uses it also to push himself forward when he has to go up hill. It may serve besides as a rest for his firelock, when he has a mind to let fly. But indeed the Norwegian peasants hold their guns free when they fire, and scarcely ever miss their mark.

It might be supposed the skaters would find a great difficulty, from the length of their wooden equipment, in turning themselves; but this is not the case. They draw backward the right foot with its shorter board, and place it at right angles with the long one wielded by the left; then they raise this latter and bring it parallel with the right: they have thus turned half round; they have only to repeat the movement if they wish completely to reverse their direction.—p. 217.

They advanced to the lower end of Lake Miossion, where the country improves in appearance, and where they observed an expedient of fertilization which would most forcibly remind an Englishman how far he must be from his own country. They saw many tracts of ground covered with pines cut down and left to dry, in order to be burnt for the sake of the ashes.

This Lake Miossion is a very narrow, and extremely deep piece of water, a hundred miles long, shut up between two ranges of mountains, whose bold and ever-varying aspects form a series of magnificent scenery.

A road along the right side of this lake, generally about midway up the acclivity from its brink, follows the projecting and retiring form of that acclivity, and places the traveller in positions for enjoying a commanding view of the long extent of water, and forming some judgement of the height of the rocks above him. Many of the eminences are clad with the verdure of millions of young pines: large ones are scarce so near the water; they are cut down and abandoned to the current, which floats them towards one or other of the

saw-mills. The verdure of the pines is very deep ; but it is enlivened by the tender green of the delicate twigs and foliage of the birch.

‘ Here and there a formidable rock advances its rugged gray front over the azure of the waters. At other places the interest of the scene is turned into alarm, when the traveller finds himself directed over the water, at the height of a hundred feet, on a road which is perhaps, nothing but a wretched scaffolding of decaying wood, and rudely formed upon the branches of trees felled so as to meet one another in falling. In trembling under the wheels, this road makes the traveller himself tremble.’ p. 33.

It seems the magnificence of this lake grows formidably sublime toward its northern extremity ; insomuch that our tourists who discover always a remarkably quick perception of that element in the sublime, which Burke maintained to be its essential principle, protests it is impossible to pursue the route in some places—‘ *sans sentir une certaine horreur religieuse—sans éprouver une certaine terreur tragique.*’ He honestly acknowledges the emotions excited by the majestic scenery to be somewhat distressing, and that it was a most welcome relief to see in one place a little spot among the precipices covered with barley almost ripe, and in another some women and children making a few handfuls of hay. Wherever there is the smallest patch capable of cultivation the people have availed themselves of it. On the margin of the lake there are some small pieces of level ground which produce good crops of rye, oats, and, in some instances, of wheat. Little solitary farm establishments for cattle, might be descried in a few places near the brow of the eminence ; sometimes about mid-way a little hamlet with a parish church, ornamented with a lively colouring of green or red ; and sometimes, though but seldom, at the water’s edge a poor fisherman’s hut, covered with moss, or bark, or wooden tiles.

‘ Thus might be seen within one rather confined field of view the three great gradations of condition in human society, which are successive and separated by ages in other countries. The lowest kind of social establishment is that in which subsistence depends on fishing ; the second that in which the people live by their flocks and herds ; the third that in which, as in the hamlets above-mentioned, they have the settled and permanent resource of agriculture.’—p. 36.

All sorts of good things produced any where from the top of the mountains to the bottom of the lake, were at the service of the adventurers at their inn of Moss-hiuis ; and many good things more, to wit, wine, sugar, coffee, &c. &c. It is mentioned here that at these houses of entertainment for strangers, it would be deemed a very uncivil thing to fix a price on their supplies and services ; this our Author considers as a relic of ancient hospitality. When their demand is inquired, ‘ What

you please,' is the answer. 'When they are satisfied with what they receive they give you a good grapple of the hand ; when dissatisfied, I do not,' says our Author, 'know how they shew it, such an instance not having come to my knowledge.' He informs us that the farmers and inn-keepers, in this part of the country, are the owners of the estates they occupy ; and he explains unsatisfactorily the actual effect of a perpetual right of reclaiming, which he states to 'exist in all its force.'

The party entered Guldbrandal, a deep and narrow valley, of about a hundred miles long, originating at the foot of the Norwegian Alps, called *Dofre Fiell*, or *Field*, and reaching down to the commencement of Lake Miossion, enlivened throughout its whole length by the river Lough, or Laagen, which at the end falls, or rather expands, into this lake ; a river which, says our Author, 'by its depth, and the volume of its waters, in the season of the melting of the snow, is in harmony with the grand objects which environ it.' And these objects, the precipitous granite mountains, &c. he begins to celebrate ; but, as if alarmed at the subject, he most suddenly starts away, and takes refuge in the wardrobe of the good people of the valley. Having minutely described the full dress, or Sunday dress, of the gentlemen and the ladies, and remarked what an indifferent figure the latter, in the hot season, make in their undress, on the working days, he detains himself as long as he can upon the moral character of the tribe before he comes to the terrors of a crazy wooden bridge over a frightful chasm. This moral character he represents as strikingly and almost wholly in contrast with that of the people of our island. With gaiety for its basis, it is a combination of quick fancy, inquisitiveness of the busy-body kind, familiarity, babbling loquacity, the love of glaring colours, contentment with poverty, contempt of commerce, love of idleness, love of peace, and complacency in dirt, or at least in slovenliness. Each of these items is put, in due point and form, against its British opposite ; but our polite Frenchman has not so little address as always to name the *direct* opposite : for instance, having attributed to these Norwegians a love of peace, how was he to adjust his contrast with complaisance to his adopted, or adopting countrymen ? Not by putting the things, as he might with truth, in the plain opprobrious form ; he would have been a simpleton not to have fallen on a much better phrase,—'the love of glory !' When his eulogium of the perfect honesty of these 'children of Guldbrandal' is inevitably made at the expense of more cultivated nations, he politely joins the capital of his native country with the capital of ours, in the observation, how much more safe a man is in the caverns of this valley than in the environs of a great city. 'Here,' he says, 'is

'the temple of honesty. Here the virtues of the golden age have found an asylum. If a man commits a criminal action he is regarded as a reprobate, and driven out of the country which, among these genuine patriots, is a formidable punishment.'

He acknowledges a very material set-off against this signal merit, in the strong addiction to spirituous liquors. The first thing after rising in a morning is commonly 'an act of adoration to Bacchus, the Bacchus of gin,' instead of the classical god, who could afford to riot among grapes and amphoræ: and this early service is followed up during the day, to its appropriate results of noisy laughter, grossness, and all sorts of disorder. Where 'the virtues of the golden age' just now attributed, dispossess themselves the while, is not said. Such is the prevalence and excess of this pernicious practice, that our Author thinks it will explain the fact of the physical degeneration of the race from the 'colossal forms of their ancestors.' He has already remarked that, with very few exceptions, they appear slight and undersized, and the more so the further he advances northward.

But now we come to the bridge of Ström-Broe, between Losnaes and Eestad.

'It is placed over a frightful chasm of a hundred feet deep and fifty wide. It is of rude contrivance, consisting merely of thick long trees laid across the gulf. On these trees are laid beams, half rotten, shaking, and not close together. Our heavy vehicle, being far more unwieldy than the cabriolets of the country—our vehicle, I say, with its six horses and half a dozen men, at the least, gave this scaffolding such a shock, and caused such a shaking, as would have made my hair stand on end, had I been all at once apprised of our situation. It quaked and bent under our feet. At this moment my companions, enthusiasts for striking scenes, called to the coachman to stop; their attention was absorbed by a view really superb.'

But none of this amusement for Mr. Lamotte; 'a most delightful scene,' he says, 'for an amateur, I dare say; but not being myself violently given that way, and having my wits enough about me to observe where we were, I took the liberty of differing from my companions, and of calling out to the coachman to take us away from the spot as fast as possible.' And, indeed, it may be that his terror did not go further from the line of sober judgement on the one side, than the tasteful temerity of his companions did on the other; and he intimates, it did not at all tend to convict him of excessive cowardice that he found, when escaped to the other side, and trying the state of one of the trees forming the bridge, that he could thrust the end of his cane two or three inches into its substance, it was so rotten. It is not improbable, he acknowledges, that the heart of

the tree might nevertheless be sound ; 'but a mere presumption' he says, very truly, 'is not altogether sufficient to keep a man's feelings quiet in a question of life or death.' The adventure taught them the prudence, for all subsequent situations of any thing like the same kind, of not aggravating their personal hazard tenfold by remaining in their lumbering carriage.

Though the inhabitants of the remoter parts of this valley, toward the northern mountains, are pronounced to be in a less civilized state, our Author says, nevertheless, that they can all read, and that they obtain newspapers, which pass round from the clergyman to the heads of the families, and furnish subjects of discourse during the long evenings of winter. The chiefs of families exercise a patriarchal authority.

Mr. L. takes his leave of this most romantic valley, with a story of the manner in which the inhabitants were cured of idolatry, about eight hundred years since.

'King Oluf Haraldson, having exerted himself to convert them to Christianity, had prevailed, partly by authority and partly by persuasion, so far as to cause to be destroyed before them, a gigantic statue of their god, Thor, the grand virtue of which was that it ate every day a quantity of meat and cakes, put into its mouth. When demolished it was found to have had in its stomach a very effective power of digestion ; a multitude of rats escaped from all parts of it, and betrayed to the people the cause of what had appeared a prodigy. They abjured Thor and were baptized. If we cannot praise the honesty of the priests of Thor, they at least cannot be charged with want of ingenuity.'

In order to pass into the province of Drontheim the party had to surmount a lofty ridge, at its most Alpine part, named Dofre Field, one of the points of which is said to be the highest ground in Scandinavia ; but Mr. L. might surely have been sensible of the impertinence of adding—'perhaps in Europe, according to the bishop of Bergen,'—when he is just going to observe that a professor of natural philosophy, of the name of Aesmark, has given the height of Dofre Field, from barometrical observations, at about eight thousand feet above the level of the sea. The summit of this mountain, he says, is an immense plain, or steppe, of coarse or swampy ground, in which are the sources of several rivers, which flow towards all the four quarters. On this plain rise here and there peaks called *Snees*, i. e. snowy points. *Snee-hutten*, the loftiest of them, is 'a colossal pyramid, presenting its front covered with icy snow.' The sight of this fired the spirits of the young men, whose enterprise Mr. L. could not share, having *luckily* hurt himself by an *unfortunate* fall.

'After infinite fatigues, they accomplished their ambitious design,

and toward midnight, on the crest of the eminence, in the midst of ice and snow, saw the last glimmerings of the western horizon. They saw also many other peaks, similar in shape, but inferior in elevation, the tops of which, white and prominent, were easily distinguished through the shades of a night of very inconsiderable darkness. In short, they enjoyed a view which must have been in the highest degree magnificent, since it repaid their excessive toil, and the perils to which they exposed themselves on the slippery rock, where the least false step might have been fatal :—

“ Mais pour les nobles cœurs le danger a des charmes.”

The summit of this peak was conjectured to be fifteen hundred feet above the elevated plain. This plain is, through its whole extent, inconceivably dreary, and inhabited and inhabitable by scarcely any thing but a few rein deer. But our Author appears to feel a degree of exultation in recording that even this melancholy tract has been forced, for once, to be the scene of most excellent cheer ; for that there, where Nature seemed to have proclaimed, from earliest time, that life itself could never have any business,—even there, as if in despite of her, have been eaten and have been drunken, ham and sausages, ‘probably of Westphalia,’ and Warwickshire cheese, and London porter, and Bordeaux wine, with the supplement of coffee and tea, qualified with ‘sugar of the Indies.’ But these were imported to the scene of this victorious revel, by the consumers themselves, as a part of the lading or ballast of their bulky travelling vehicle.

There are two post-houses on Dofre Field, in which are found existing two human families, beyond all doubt conveyed thither, and spell-bound there, by the power of some magician. But indeed it is only during three months of the year that his spell is necessary for the purpose of their detention ; for these houses, says our Author, ‘must be consigned to snow and solitude during nine months of the year. The snow is sometimes so deep, that the inhabitants, if they go out of them, ‘must go out by the chimnies.’ From about the northern end of Lake MioSSION, all the way to these post-houses on the mountains, the character of the climate, according even to the indulgent estimate of it entertained by the natives, is indicated by the fact, that the windows are not made to open ; the portion of the year during which it might be desirable to admit the external air, being too short, compared with the remainder, to make it worth while to go to the cost of hinges. The consequence however is, that the included air, with which they seem desirous to form as permanent an association as that of marriage, acquires such a quality as even these good people, though very little prone to take offence at unsavoury odours, are put upon expedients for abating ; and twigs of fir, and of

juniper with the berries, are strewed on the floor, for the benefit of the aromatic scent they yield when trodden upon.

The party had a long descent, with a beautiful series of *villas*, to Drontheim, where we soon find them playing their part at a dinner party of 'le Général du Croc (Van Croghen ou *Van Kraagh*)' governor of the province and its capital, and at a *fête champêtre* given by the Lieutenant-general Count de Schmettow. The former of these parties 'was engaging to the last degree;' the latter entertainment was engaging probably beyond that degree, for it was 'infinitely affecting.' In correctness we should have said that this fête was given by his two daughters, to 'the Countess their mother;' and the irresistibly affecting part of this masquerading concern was that in which, the Countess being formally seated in public exhibition,

'— her two daughters, accompanied by two other young ladies, habited as shepherdesses, and carrying baskets of flowers, appeared on the green turf, made to the countess the most ardent demonstrations of filial piety, put themselves in attitudes of respectful tenderness, sang couplets composed for the occasion, danced a little ballet, and ended by embracing their good parent, who was moved to tears. Nor was she the only person that was affected; a number of ladies embraced her with sympathetic emotion.' p. 69.

This pantomime of sensibility, got up with long contrivance and preparation, and acted before a numerous rabble of genteel gazers, and as a sequel to some insipid drolleries which are previously recounted, doubtless appeared to our Author a very fine thing, and incomparably more affecting than any spontaneous effusion of tenderness in the quiet simplicity of domestic society. So much are the feelings, tastes, and understandings, of some human beings, and even tribes of human beings, bewitched by theatrical show and trickery. The Author does not say whether like himself, the two Englishmen regarded this operatic exhibition as 'infinitely touching.' To relieve any spectator that might be affected to a painful excess by the scene, it was followed, after an interval of promenading, and luxurious eating and drinking, by a plentiful supply of the inferior order of masquerade fooleries.

Quitting Drontheim after nine days, they returned southward in a line considerably eastward of the track by which they had ascended. They had several stages of bad roads and no entertainment. Crossing several times the river Guul, the Author mentions a dreadful phenomenon that happened in the year 1344, in which the sudden disappearance of this river was followed by its bursting the ground with a violent eruption, which raised such a mass of stones and earth across the valley

as to cause an inundation, by which a great number of farms were flooded and destroyed, and several hundred persons drowned. This great bar was after some time broken down and carried away by the weight of the accumulated waters. The disappearance of the river must have been occasioned by its falling into some subterraneous gulf, which it filled till the pressure upward became irresistible.

On traversing the territory from Drontheim to Røraas, a space of 113 miles, Mr. L. remarks, 'I do not believe we have met 'one single chaise, or more than one man on horseback, or 'more than five persons on the road. What a villanous country, might a Christian statesman truly mutter to himself, for 'finance, speculation, and ambition.'

Røraas is a town of two or three thousand people on the confines of Lapland.

'At a distance its appearance is miserable, the roofs being covered with birch bark, and turf, instead of tiles or slates, and the wooden walls not being painted. On looking among the neighbouring declivities, to descry the town, we have a difficulty of ascertaining that we see it. We perceive only a great number of little sloping plots of ground, with heaps of stones: these pieces of ground are the roofs, and these piles of stones are the chimnies. The environs are dreary and desolate, having been despoiled of their natural clothing, the forests of birch.' p. 79.

The place is famous for its copper mines, yielding, as our Author believes, the best metal of that kind; and it is inhabited chiefly by the families of the miners, a class of people exceeded in wretchedness of appearance, he says, only by fishermen. And certainly his picture of their personal economy will not be likely to excite the envy of any one, unless perhaps the idea should occur, that such a surface and garb, could they be suddenly acquired, would be a disguise that might defy the hunting inquisition of the messengers of justice. A curious description is given of the manner in which the miners sustain their waking and sleeping existence, when above the ground, crowded by hundreds in a sort of wretched barracks, where each man has a bare plank for the alternate uses of a dinner table and a bed. This is their lodgement during the part of the week that they are held in requisition for the mine, that is, from Monday to Thursday. If thus far they made but an humble and disgusting exhibition, they grew upon our Author's senses and imagination to something almost formidable, when they had him down in their nether regions; where the long descent, the begrimed imps waving torches, the voices which seemed to sound 'lugubrious and sepulchral,' the explosions, and the thundering echoes, suggested to him, he

says, the idea of Erebus, and perhaps with a more vivid impression than he had ever received from classical description. He confesses he was not sorry to find himself restored to the world of day-light. He very properly avails himself of the remainder of the gravity forced upon him in this gloomy sojourn, and moralizes till it is expended, upon the topic of the balance and equality in the condition of mankind, with respect to the degree of happiness. He affirms that, in spite of appearances, the general adjustment is such as to place all classes exactly on a level; and for a specific illustration, draws out the items of the balance between a cultivated rover, himself for instance, and these squalid miners, of whom he doubts whether one could be found willing to exchange conditions with him, were it possible. It is in this section that he takes occasion to notice a remarkable circumstance of exemption or deprivation in the civil economy of the country, relative to the artificial inequalities of society; there has been no nobility for many ages. The order was extirpated, he says, by the ancient monarchy of the country, and it has been the policy of the Danish government never to create it anew.

The party drove gayly on, and in due time were met by some very expressive and animated signs of their approach to the civilized world; for what could be a stronger intimation of that delectable vicinity than the alarm of war? The news of the bombardment of Copenhagen flew through the country; the travellers were arrested as Englishmen, and conveyed to Christiania, and afterwards to Kongsberg, the Norwegian Verdun, as Mr. L. not unaptly names it; though it must be acknowledged that the prisoners had considerably less to complain of than their fellow-countrymen held in durance at that less remote fortress. They were treated with all the politeness and indulgence compatible with a state of custody, and a little tragic ululation introduced here and there can be taken only as a diversity in the Author's mode of amusing himself. They enjoyed nearly as much as they pleased of the most cultivated society in the country, could pursue their studies in whatever time was left for solitude, and, after about ten weeks, were set at liberty, and made off for Sweden.—This little untoward adventure is, to the reader, an entertaining part of the story; and as to the heroes of it, they carried upon them no marks of the galling of fetters, no furrowed traces of grief and despair, during their rapid scamper through Gottenburgh, Orebro, Stockholm, Upsal, and Gottenburgh again, on their way to this country.

In the latter sections and in the Appendix, there is a variety of brief information concerning the history, religion, politics, and natural productions of Norway. Mr. L. goes back so far

as to cause an inundation, by which a great number of farms were flooded and destroyed, and several hundred persons drowned. This great bar was after some time broken down and carried away by the weight of the accumulated waters. The disappearance of the river must have been occasioned by its falling into some subterraneous gulf, which it filled till the pressure upward became irresistible.

On traversing the territory from Drontheim to Røraas, a space of 113 miles, Mr. L. remarks, 'I do not believe we have met 'one single chaise, or more than one man on horseback, or 'more than five persons on the road. What a villanous country, might a Christian statesman truly mutter to himself, for 'finance, speculation, and ambition.'

Røraas is a town of two or three thousand people on the confines of Lapland.

'At a distance its appearance is miserable, the roofs being covered with birch bark, and turf, instead of tiles or slates, and the wooden walls not being painted. On looking among the neighbouring declivities, to descry the town, we have a difficulty of ascertaining that we see it. We perceive only a great number of little sloping plots of ground, with heaps of stones: these pieces of ground are the roofs, and these piles of stones are the chimnies. The environs are dreary and desolate, having been despoiled of their natural clothing, the forests of birch.' p. 79.

The place is famous for its copper mines, yielding, as our Author believes, the best metal of that kind; and it is inhabited chiefly by the families of the miners, a class of people exceeded in wretchedness of appearance, he says, only by fishermen. And certainly his picture of their personal economy will not be likely to excite the envy of any one, unless perhaps the idea should occur, that such a surface and garb, could they be suddenly acquired, would be a disguise that might defy the hunting inquisition of the messengers of justice. A curious description is given of the manner in which the miners sustain their waking and sleeping existence, when above the ground, crowded by hundreds in a sort of wretched barracks, where each man has a bare plank for the alternate uses of a dinner table and a bed. This is their lodgement during the part of the week that they are held in requisition for the mine, that is, from Monday to Thursday. If thus far they made but an humble and disgusting exhibition, they grew upon our Author's senses and imagination to something almost formidable, when they had him down in their nether regions; where the long descent, the begrimed imps waving torches, the voices which seemed to sound 'lugubrious and sepulchral,' the explosions, and the thundering echoes, suggested to him, he

says, the idea of Erebus, and perhaps with a more vivid impression than he had ever received from classical description. He confesses he was not sorry to find himself restored to the world of day-light. He very properly avails himself of the remainder of the gravity forced upon him in this gloomy sojourn, and moralizes till it is expended, upon the topic of the balance and equality in the condition of mankind, with respect to the degree of happiness. He affirms that, in spite of appearances, the general adjustment is such as to place all classes exactly on a level; and for a specific illustration, draws out the items of the balance between a cultivated rover, himself for instance, and these squalid miners, of whom he doubts whether one could be found willing to exchange conditions with him, were it possible. It is in this section that he takes occasion to notice a remarkable circumstance of exemption or deprivation in the civil economy of the country, relative to the artificial inequalities of society; there has been no nobility for many ages. The order was extirpated, he says, by the ancient monarchy of the country, and it has been the policy of the Danish government never to create it anew.

The party drove gayly on, and in due time were met by some very expressive and animated signs of their approach to the civilized world; for what could be a stronger intimation of that delectable vicinity than the alarm of war? The news of the bombardment of Copenhagen flew through the country; the travellers were arrested as Englishmen, and conveyed to Christiania, and afterwards to Kongsberg, the Norwegian Verdun, as Mr. L. not unaptly names it; though it must be acknowledged that the prisoners had considerably less to complain of than their fellow-countrymen held in durance at that less remote fortress. They were treated with all the politeness and indulgence compatible with a state of custody, and a little tragic ululation introduced here and there can be taken only as a diversity in the Author's mode of amusing himself. They enjoyed nearly as much as they pleased of the most cultivated society in the country, could pursue their studies in whatever time was left for solitude, and, after about ten weeks, were set at liberty, and made off for Sweden. This little untoward adventure is, to the reader, an entertaining part of the story; and as to the heroes of it, they carried upon them no marks of the galling of fetters, no furrowed traces of grief and despair, during their rapid scamper through Gottenburgh, Orebro, Stockholm, Upsal, and Gottenburgh again, on their way to this country.

In the latter sections and in the Appendix, there is a variety of brief information concerning the history, religion, politics, and natural productions of Norway. Mr. L. goes back so far

as the fabulous period extending from the invasion of Odin, some time before the beginning of the Christian era, to the eighth century of that era. He represents that the imperfect amalgamation of the Asiatic invaders with the original population of these northern regions, is still apparent in the mutual antipathy between the Laplanders and Finlanders, the descendants of the original inhabitants, and the Norwegians, the descendants of the Asiatic intruders. He puts in chronological rows many rusty names of barbarous royalty, dug up from the tumuli of Scandinavian annals. He celebrates the formidable naval power by which, in the ninth and the tenth centuries, after the union of the petty principalities of Norway into one monarchy under Harold Haarfager, the Danes and Norwegians carried piracy and invasion to almost all the coasts of Europe. And in the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries he finds them obeying the great law of mutability to which the states of the world have hitherto been subjected, and losing their maritime and commercial predominance.

He describes the political state of Norway, as it has existed during the last century, and as it existed at the time of the printing of this book, that has hardly yet lost the transitory scent of books fresh from the press; but which state is now a matter of almost forgotten history. The government, it seems, was perfectly despotic, and was rendered so in acquiescence with the wishes of the people a century and a half ago. And all the better, says our Author, has the case been with them since the matter was so settled. He says, that notwithstanding this remarkable act of voluntary loyalty, there is a spirit in them that makes it little less than a compulsory policy on the monarch to behave handsomely to them.

The ecclesiastical constitution is Lutheran and episcopal. The clergy are described as diligent and respected; and the false philosophy and the infidelity of the more southern states of Europe have hardly penetrated, at least have not manifested themselves, among the disciples of the Norwegian pastors.

There is nothing in Mr. Lamotte's book to provoke critical hostility. He is a lively, good-humoured relater of incidents and adventures, not pretending to the spirit either of ambitious enterprise or deep philosophy. He is successful in attempting to place before us the obvious features of a scene which is not yet rendered so familiar to us as to make us impatient of slight superficial sketches.

Besides an elegant map, the volume contains fifteen views, chiefly of very picturesque scenery, rather small, but beautifully etched by G. Cooke.

Art. III. *The Evidence and Authority of the Christian Revelation.*
By the Rev. Thomas Chalmers, Minister of Kilmany. Small 8vo.
pp. viii. 266. Price 7s. 6d. bds. Longman and Co. 1814.

TO urge a just claim on public attention to new discussions of a subject already elucidated by every variety of talent, required at least an unusual degree of acuteness in remark, and felicity of composition. As there is no topic in which the interests of man are more vitally implicated, so there is none perhaps which has called into exertion the powers of the human mind to a greater extent, than that of the '*Evidence and Authority of the Christian Revelation.*' Having originally, by the justness of its claims, forced its way in opposition to the passions and interests of mankind; having triumphed over the hostility of imperial power, and the despotic influence of ancient superstition; Christianity, patronised by temporal governments, adorned with the pomp, and guarded by the power of hierarchical establishments, at length obtained the right of prescription, was received without investigation, and for ages professed without conviction.

But the Christianity of popes and emperors, was not the Christianity of apostles and martyrs. The institutions of God had been corrupted, to serve the pride and ambition of man. When, therefore, the human intellect awoke from the slumbers of a long and dreary night, instead of finding itself conducted by the holy light of heaven, it discovered that it had been misled by a deceptive glare from the torch of superstition. Ceremonies and fables of man's device being blended with the pure mysteries and sacred truths of religion, derived support from its authority, and veneration from its sanctity. Truth was indeed united with the error, but was so concealed by the prominence of the false, that in the mind of the superficial observer, they became identified. When freedom of inquiry succeeded the servility of implicit faith, it was soon discovered that much which had been received as resting on the authority of God, had no better origin than the selfish policy of man. Indignant at the thought of being enslaved by names and titles, of being deceived by the tricks of pontiffs and priests,—but unhappily not distinguishing between the pure and the corrupt, men began not only to doubt the claims of revealed religion, but to impugn it as a public offence against the rights and happiness of mankind. In avoiding the error of those who received every thing sanctioned by the Church as true, it was easy to fall into that of rejecting every thing as false. Every thing previously esteemed sacred, became the jest of the witty and the contempt of the profligate. Persons even of better principles and of stronger minds, could not secure themselves from the influence of prejudice or of fear. Since the doctrines of faith seemed all to rest on the same authority, and

since many could not be true, why might not all be false? This was not less hoped by the bad, than it was feared by the good, and hence originated an almost universal inquiry into the 'evidence and authority of the Christian faith.'

The investigation was commenced with activity, and carried on with vigour, but the issue was not long doubtful. Wholly regardless of the decrees of councils and the mandates of popes, it was soon found that the history of Jesus Christ was a faithful history, and his doctrine worthy of all acceptance. Infidelity and scepticism, driven out of the field, dispersed themselves into companies, and occasionally skirmished from their hiding-places. Instead, however, of accomplishing their purpose, their efforts served only to call forth fresh aid in defence of the cause they opposed. The industry of research and acumen of criticism, employed on this subject, are without parallel; and the number and variety of proofs on which the hopes of the Christian may rest, have accumulated almost beyond conception. The facts on which the argument depends, have long been familiar; and it might naturally have been inferred that new efforts would but tend to weaken its force. Mr. Chalmers, however, has shewn that the subject was not yet exhausted; that observations new and interesting might still be adduced with considerable effect.

Whatever impression we felt on learning that an essay on this subject, contained in the *Edinburgh Encyclopædia*, was announced for separate publication, we now fully coincide in opinion with the advisers of that measure, and consider this little work as a valuable acquisition to the cause of truth and piety. Could we suppose that sceptics of the present day would come to an investigation of the claims of Christianity, with the same integrity of understanding which they would bring to a subject of literary speculation, we might hope that enough is presented in this Treatise, to leave infidelity not only without excuse, but without an advocate. The case of unbelievers now, and more especially in this country, we consider as exceedingly different from that of the unbelievers among whom infidelity took its rise and obtained the widest diffusion. In Roman Catholic countries, where belief is totally independent of evidence, and where evidence would frequently fail, it is not surprising that revealed religion should be discredited. Where superstition is predominant, it expected only a sufficient degree of independence to demand proof of what we are expected to credit, and of penetration to discover that that proof does not exist, in order to reject it; but when it is a religion descended from heaven, and accredited by many independent and unimpeachable witnesses, that solicits acceptance, if we then refuse assent, the event must be attributed,

not to the exercise of the understanding, but to the influence of the heart. If the accumulated evidence in favour of the Christian Scriptures, now before the world, is rejected as insufficient, conviction is not to be expected from still stronger testimony:—"Neither would they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

In order to determine what is the lowest degree of evidence in favour of Christianity requisite to command the assent of conscience, or, in the event of rejecting it, to leave conscience without excuse, demonstration is by no means necessary, mere probability being completely adequate. In the judgement of reason, the least preponderance of evidence is binding; for how can we justify the rejection of what there is greater reason to believe to be true than false? Difficulties inexplicable by us may occur, but they cannot annihilate evidence. Nor is it to be conceded to the infidel that he is without blame, till decisive proof be furnished of what he refuses to believe. The Christian, that he may vindicate himself, and condemn his opponent, has only to shew that nothing can be urged against the object of his faith, which would counterbalance what may be produced in its favour. If neither falsehood nor absurdity can be justly charged upon Christianity, mysteries, or apparent discordances, can avail nothing in the view of reason against the least possible degree of positive evidence for its truth. As we cannot without rashness assume, *à priori*, that a revelation from God would contain nothing obscure, nothing which could not be misunderstood, so, when judging of its truth or falsehood, no instances of incomprehensibility or of depth can fairly come within calculation. From the very nature of it, the character of a revelation must be unknown till we have that revelation. External testimony, therefore, can be equipoised only by contrary testimony, or by direct contradiction.

Let it be supposed, then, that we had no means of tracing the history of Christianity; that every document from the apostolic age to the present time were lost; and that all the data on which we are called to form a judgement, were—the facts of the existence of the Christian Scriptures,—of the Institutions yet in being of which they speak,—and the popular belief that those Scriptures and Institutions are Divine.—This is the lowest kind of evidence which we can suppose; but even this were sufficient to prevent an upright man from rejecting it, unless he could prove that those books are forgeries, could account for the introduction of baptism and the eucharist, and assign a cause for popular belief; or unless he could shew that the writings which profess to be from God, contain some things impossible in themselves, or false in fact. He might regret

that his incitements to duty were so feeble, and his hopes for the world to come sustained by so weak a basis ; but he could no more forsake probability for scepticism, than, because the skiff in which he might be sailing was slender, he would hasten the death he feared, by leaping into the sea. That there may be circumstances in the very matter of a professed revelation, however it may be supported by public records, by positive rites, and by popular credit, sufficient to destroy its authority over the mind, cannot be doubted ; otherwise, the native of India, or of Turkey, might, without guilt, adopt the superstition of his country. But since no law of the human mind is stronger than that by which it rejects absurdity and contradiction, no external evidence can accredit them. These objections, however, do not attach to the Christian Scriptures, for absurdity and mystery—contradiction and difficulty—are not to be confounded. By the former, all evidence is nullified ; by the latter, it is not rendered even suspicious. No man doubts that he lives, thinks, walks, because life, cogitation, and self-motion, are things which he cannot comprehend. Mere comprehensibleness is not the test of credibility. The infidel, therefore, would stand convicted from the simple fact, that Christianity has possession of the public mind ; that it is supported by written documents and perpetuated institutions.

Were the object of hesitation in the mind of an honest inquirer after truth,—not whether religion in any form, is adapted to the nature of man, (of which none but an Atheist can doubt,) but whether Christianity be that religion which deserves his confidence :—after investigating, by way of comparison, the various professed systems of religious faith, should Christianity prove decidedly superior, should that superiority be great, and, of all received revelations, should this only be judged above the invention of man, and not indebted to human power for its success ; would not such an honest inquirer be justified in receiving it as the gift of Heaven ?—If there be a remedy in the world for the disorders of human nature, would he not feel consolation in the thought, that he is in possession of that remedy ?—and if there be a path leading from this scene of weeping, and toil, and death, to the region of rest and immortal life,—that he is walking in that path, and has already a glimpse of that pleasant land ?—To determine the conduct of a wise man, it were sufficient to know, that if this world of sense and darkness was ever visited by a prophet from the unseen country to guide our doubtful steps, and sooth our wounded spirits, that prophet was Jesus Christ. By confiding in him who declared that he came from the bosom of the Everlasting Father, and that he is the Saviour of the world, there is, on the one hand, at least

possibility that we may reach an abode of safety and enjoyment; and, by rejecting him, there is, on the other hand, even at the best, an equal possibility that we may be punished with endless pain. In his election of the alternative who can hesitate?

Mr. Chalmers modestly says, that

‘His aim is fulfilled, if he succeed in proving the external testimony of Christianity to be so sufficient as to leave infidelity without excuse, even though the remaining important branches of the Christian defence had been less strong and satisfactory than they are.’

We think that at the bar of heaven, even without the ample testimony which Mr. Chalmers illustrates, infidelity must have been without excuse. How could a man answer it either to God or his own conscience, that he preferred scepticism to probability—the hazard of eternal death, to the hope, how small soever it might be, of everlasting life. But if by the mere right of prescriptive tenure, and the influence of comparative claim, Christianity could maintain authority over reason and conscience, what must be the force of obligation imposed by her when she comes attended by all the evidence furnished by experience and testimony?

Let the young inquirer into the truth of Christianity, whose conscience has not yet been seared by profane wit, nor his heart hardened by desperate crime, instead of expecting the clearness of intuition in doctrine, and the force of demonstration in evidence, ask, as a necessary pre-requisite to forming just views of this subject, what is the lowest degree of credibility which God might in strict justice have afforded; and then, instead of indulging complaint on the plea of deficiency, he will cultivate gratitude for the abundance of positive proofs on which his faith and hope may confidently repose. Let him remember that, as in the common affairs of life, no man would be justified in an entire suspension of endeavour, because he had not all the light to direct him which might be afforded, so, in the concerns of religion, no man can excuse infidelity, because faith is not sustained by all the evidence which incredulity might require. In favour of their scepticism, men are apt to make exceptions to the general constitution of things; and in matters of faith, to suppose, not that it is their duty to act according to the best light which is vouchsafed to them, but that they have a right to complain when there is not all which they might choose to demand;—not, that if Christianity cannot be proved to be false, it must be received as true, but, that if it be possible it may not be true, it must be rejected as false. According to their system, the idea of accountability is absurd, for where there is no alternative there can be no free agency, and as long

as it is possible for the human mind to disbelieve, it is not bound to believe. But were there no room for objection, there could be no responsibility, and without responsibility, revelation would be useless: in the very notion of revelation, therefore, it is implied that men may reject it. The question is not whether men may find plausible pretences enabling them to render the Scriptures suspicious, but whether they have ground on which to rest a rational belief of them. Now, while all belief is rational, which is sustained by probability, it is as truly, if not as highly irrational, to reject a small, as a great preponderance of evidence, and no man can act irrationally without incurring guilt. No man, therefore, can excuse himself from the obligation of faith, until he have shewn, not that there are objections against Christianity, but that they exceed, or at least counterbalance, arguments in its favour.

To ascertain the true state of the fact, it is necessary to determine, not the *number* merely, but the *weight* of objections on the one side, and of arguments on the other; and that we may judge of this, especial notice must be taken of their kind. There are some principles which must be regarded as ultimate laws of human belief; there are others, which, though they possess an influence in producing conviction, more or less urgent according to circumstances, yet, from their very nature, must be considered as inferior, and far less worthy of reliance. Let the inquiry be respecting any contingent fact, and there may be a variety of sources whence we may form an opinion, but the only decisive evidence is, either sensation, consciousness, or testimony; and where these are undeniable, every inference from assumed general principles, from analogy, from a singular concurrence of circumstances, or from mysterious difficulties, must yield to the authority of that evidence which the constitution of our nature has fixed as ultimate. Were the properties of two substances carefully examined, and accurately detailed to a person, he might form conjectures on the nature of the compound which would result from their mixture; he might suppose and believe that it would blend the qualities of the simple ingredients; but, should he be credibly informed that the experiment had been made, and that it had not the properties expected, but had acquired others of which he could have formed no conjecture, no difficulty of accounting for the fact could suspend his belief of it. Every man, in the ordinary affairs of life, soon learns to know whether hypothesis or experience, whether analogical inference or testimony, has the greater claim to credit; and it is plain, that the rules of right reason bind us to the same conduct in moral and in religious concerns. When we are inclined to depart from it, there is ground to suspect the interference either of passion or of prejudice. No ob-

objections, therefore, founded on general reasoning, how strong soever they may be, can avail against proof of fact.

As the appropriate evidence both of the truth and justice of things revealed, is the fact *that they are revealed*, so, to object against a proof of this fact, that those things are unjust, unbecoming, or untrue, is indeed nothing less than a *petitio principii*; that is to say, in order to prove that they are not revealed, it is to *assume* that they are not. To arguments from what is denominated the internal evidence of Christianity, or the purity of its doctrines and excellence of its precepts, may fairly be opposed objections against its doctrines or its precepts, but none of these can be confronted with the direct proofs that it is a system revealed from heaven. The order of such proofs, is altogether superior to the order of such objections, inasmuch as our notions of right and wrong are not inherently so correct, or worthy of credit, as the evidence of fact which is supplied by testimony and experience. The Christian may prove a doctrine to be true because it is revealed, but an infidel cannot prove that it is not revealed, because he thinks it untrue; for the evidence on which the former rests the proof of fact, is of a higher kind than that on which the objector builds his speculation. If, therefore, Christianity founds its claims not only upon its excellence, but upon the direct evidence of its being a revelation, nothing can be set in opposition to its demands, but a proof that it is not revealed; and as the affirmative is sustained by testimony and sensation, so the negative can be supported only by counter testimony and opposite experience.

The inquirer after truth, having duly considered the comparative want of authority over human belief, which is attached to the very nature of those objections which oppose the claims of Christianity, and the decisive species of evidence which supports them, will then be prepared to examine what degree of that higher evidence is afforded, and what peculiar circumstances may farther modify its force.

It is particularly to be noticed, that the truth and authority of the Christian religion depend upon the reality of certain events. If these events can be proved to have actually occurred, the inference that Christianity must be true, cannot be resisted. The question therefore becomes, in this view of it, merely a question of history. The events which form the basis of the Christian faith, though in some respects peculiar, agree with other events in this, that they were to be judged of by the senses. They were addressed to those ultimate sources of human knowledge, the eye, the ear, the feeling. Persons, who were living and were present when they occurred, could be under

no doubt in regard to their having taken place. The conviction was of the highest kind and absolutely irresistible. It is a circumstance which must not be overlooked, that the reality of those facts was not to the reporters of them matter of opinion, but of knowledge; they tell us not what they supposed or believed merely, but what they saw, and heard, and felt. We rely not on their understanding, but on their veracity. As the proof to them was of the highest kind which a person can have of a contemporaneous event, so that to us is of the highest kind which we can have of one anterior. Theirs was experience, ours is written testimony. Though the medium of proof by which these facts are established is, however, precisely the same as that by which other events recorded in history are authenticated, yet there are various circumstances which modify its influence on the human mind.

It is obvious that witnesses on this question, cannot be interrogated with the same coolness, nor their testimonies balanced by the same unbiassed judgement, as when the consequence involved implicates no one's interest or prejudice. On the one hand, an affectation of singularity; a loftiness of mind which courts the praise of being superior to popular superstition; the pride of a fortitude which pretends not to fear dangers at the thought of which others tremble; associated ideas of weakness, a low taste, and a degrading enthusiasm, which too often characterize professors of Christianity; hatred of the hypocrisy and priestcraft frequently apparent in those who have assumed the direction among its ministers; and, above all, wishes that it may not be true; all operate powerfully against the facts adduced in its favour: but, on the other hand, the importance of the conclusion, the value of the stake pledged while that conclusion is suspended, the influence of sentiment and feeling, early prepossessions, and the very sacredness of the subject, may produce an undue preponderance in the mind, even antecedent to evidence, on the side of its truth.

Some of these circumstances are considered in the first chapter of the work now before us, and particularly those which seem calculated to mingle their influence in favour of Christianity. With no less justice than ingenuity the Author contends, however, that, on the whole, these very considerations, which seem at first sight so likely to bribe judgement and to facilitate conviction, have in fact the contrary tendency. They are circumstances of which every man is aware, and of whose influence he is so jealous, as to have his mind discomposed by a morbid suspicion of them, and to feel an injurious fastidiousness whenever they can be supposed to operate. It is in consequence of this, that the testimony of a heathen is so much

preferred to that of a Christian, even while we admit that the Christian could not be biassed by interest.

To prove the authenticity of the New Testament, its advocates are furnished with testimonies incomparably more numerous and unexceptionable than can be adduced for the writings of any ancient classic; and therefore no one who would cite the writings of Xenophon, Cicero, or Tacitus, as authentic, can without inconsistency impeach those of John or Paul. The reason that the latter have been called in question, while the former continue unsuspected; is evidently not deficiency of documents to support them, but the influence of some false principle. No one is interested in discrediting the one; while many would rejoice at being released from the authority of the other. Even the enemies of Christianity afford very efficient witnesses in this case and their testimony is important; but our Author justly contends, that these are far from being entitled to the superior confidence which is usually placed in them. Every principle of just criticism would lead us to regard Christian writers as of far superior value.

'In contradiction to every approved principle,' says our Author, 'we prefer the distant and the later testimony, to the testimony of writers, who carry as much evidence and legitimate authority along with them; and who only differ from others in being nearer the original sources of information. We neglect and undervalue the evidence which the New Testament itself furnishes, and rest the whole of the argument upon the external and superinduced testimony of subsequent authors. A great deal of all this is owing to the manner in which the defence of Christianity has been conducted by its friends and supporters. They have given too much into the suspicions of the opposite party. They have yielded their minds to the infection of their scepticism, and maintained, through the whole process, a caution and a delicacy which they often carry to a degree that is excessive; and by which, in fact, they have done injustice to their own arguments. Some of them begin with the testimony of Tacitus as a first principle, and pursue the investigation upwards, as if the evidence that we collect from the annals of the Roman historian were stronger than that of the Christian writers who flourished nearer the scene of the investigation, and whose credibility can be established on grounds which are altogether independent of his testimony. In this way, they come at last to the credibility of the New Testament writers, but by a lengthened and circuitous procedure. The reader feels as if the argument were diluted at every step in the process of derivation, and his faith in the Gospel history is much weaker than his faith in histories that are far less authenticated. Bring Tacitus and the New Testament to an immediate comparison, and subject them both to the touchstone of ordinary and received principles, and it will be found that the latter leaves the former out of sight in all the marks, and character, and evidences of an authentic history. The

truth of the Gospel stands on a much firmer and more independent footing, than many of its defenders would dare to give us any conception of. They want that boldness of argument which the merits of the question entitle them to assume. * They ought to maintain a more decided front to their adversaries, and tell them, that, in the New Testament itself—in the concurrence of its numerous, and distant, and independent authors—in the uncontradicted authority which it has maintained from the earliest times of the church—in the total inability of the bitterest adversaries of our religion to impeach its credibility—in the genuine characters of honesty and fairness which it carries on the face of it; that in these, and in every thing else, which can give validity to the written history of past times, there is a weight and a splendour of evidence, which the testimony of Tacitus cannot confirm, and which the absence of that testimony could not have diminished.

* If it were necessary, in a court of justice, to ascertain the circumstances of a certain transaction which happened in a particular neighbourhood, the obvious expedient would be to examine the agents and the eye-witnesses of that transaction. If six or eight concurred in giving the same testimony—if there was no appearance of collusion amongst them—if they had the manner and aspect of creditable men—above all, if this testimony were made public, and not a single individual, from the numerous spectators of the transaction alluded to, stepped forward to falsify it, then, we apprehend, the proof would be looked upon as complete. Other witnesses might be summoned from a distance to give in their testimony, not of what they saw, but of what they heard upon the subject; but their concurrence, though a happy enough circumstance, would never be looked upon as any material addition to the evidence already brought forward. Another Court of Justice might be held in a distant country, and years after the death of the original witnesses. It might have occasion to verify the same transaction, and for this purpose might call in the only evidence which it was capable of collecting—the testimony of men who lived after the transaction in question, and at a great distance from the place where it happened. There would be no hesitation in ordinary cases about the relative value of the two testimonies; and the record of the first court could be appealed to by posterity as by far the more valuable document, and far more decisive of the point in controversy. Now, what we complain of, is, that in the instance before us, this principle is reversed. The report of hearsay witnesses is held in higher estimation than the report of original agents and spectators. The most implicit credit is given to the testimony of the distant and later historians, and the testimony of the original witnesses is received with as much distrust as if they carried the marks of villainy and imposture upon their foreheads.' pp. 28—32.

Of the principle here adverted to, no one can be unconscious. We must at least confess that a distrust of the Christian witnesses prevails so far, that we no sooner find a corroboration of any fact from a Pagan writer, than we feel as if we had stepped

on firmer ground. This feeling is analyzed in the work before us, with much judgement, originality, and force, and counteracted so effectually as at least to raise the character of the original testimonies, if not to invest them with their proper authority.

On the internal marks of truth and honesty to be found in the New Testament; it were sufficient praise to say, that in comparison with what had been previously written on this subject, the impression produced loses nothing of its vivacity;—that thoughts are not diluted into weakness;—that topics of argument do not derive less support from each other; and that the effect is not less accumulative and powerful:—but we may say even more than this, for, in proportion to the quantity our Author has, perhaps, done better than others, what many have done well. Our readers will be gratified with the following extract from this part of the work.

‘When the difference betwixt two historians is carried to the length of a contradiction, it enfeebles the credit of both their testimonies. When the agreement is carried to the length of a close and scrupulous resemblance in every particular, it destroys the credit of one of the parties as an independent historian. In the case before us we neither perceive this difference nor this agreement. Such are the variations, that, at first sight, the reader is alarmed with the appearance of very serious and embarrassing difficulties. And such is the actual coincidence, that the difficulties vanish when we apply to them the labours of a profound and intelligent criticism. Had it been the object of the gospel writers to trick out a plausible imposition on the credulity of the world, they would have studied a closer resemblance to the existing authorities of that period; nor would they have laid themselves open to the superficial brilliancy of Voltaire, which dazzles every imagination, and reposed their vindication with the Lelands and Lardners of a distant posterity, whose sober erudition is so little attended to, and which so few know how to appreciate.

‘In the gospels, we are told that Herod, the Tetrarch of Galilee, married his brother Philip’s wife. In Josephus we have the same story; only he gives a different name to Philip, and calls him Herod; and what adds to the difficulty, there was a Philip of that family, whom we know not to have been the first husband of Herodias. This is at first sight a little alarming. But, in the progress of our enquiries, we are given to understand from this same Josephus, that there were three Herods in the same family, and therefore no improbability in there being two Philips. We also know from the histories of that period, that it was quite common for the same individual to have two names; and this is never more necessary than when employed to distinguish brothers who have one name the same. The Herod who is called Philip, is just as likely a distinction as the Simon who is called Peter, or the Saul who is called Paul. The name of the High Priest, at the time of our Saviour’s

crucifixion, was Caiaphas, according to the Evangelists. According to Josephus, the name of the High Priest at that period was Joseph. This would have been precisely a difficulty of the same kind, had not Josephus happened to mention, that this Joseph was also called Caiaphas. Would it have been dealing fairly with the Evangelists, we ask, to have made their credibility depend upon the accidental omission of another historian? Is it consistent with any acknowledged principle of sound criticism, to bring four writers so entirely under the tribunal of Josephus, each of whom stands as firmly supported by all the evidences which can give authority to an historian; and who have greatly the advantage of him in this, that they can add the argument of their concurrence to the argument of each separate and independent testimony? It so happens, however, in the present instance, that even Jewish writers, in their narrative of the same circumstance, give the name of Philip to the first husband of Herodias. We by no means conceive, that any foreign testimony was necessary for the vindication of the Evangelists. Still, however, it must go far to dissipate every suspicion of artifice in the construction of their histories. It proves that, in the confidence with which they delivered themselves up to their own information, they neglected appearance, and felt themselves independent of it. This apparent difficulty, like many others of the same kind, lands us in a stronger confirmation of the honesty of the Evangelists; and it is delightful to perceive, how truth receives a fuller accession to its splendour, from the attempts which are made to disgrace and to darken it.

‘On this branch of the argument, the impartial inquirer must be struck with the little indulgence which Infidels, and even Christians, have given to the Evangelical writers. In other cases when we compare the narratives of cotemporary historians, it is not expected, that all the circumstances alluded to by one will be taken notice of by the rest; and it often happens that an event or a custom is admitted upon the faith of a single historian; and the silence of all other writers is not suffered to attach suspicion or discredit to his testimony. It is an allowed principle, that a scrupulous resemblance betwixt two histories is very far from necessary to their being held consistent with one another. And what is more, it sometimes happens, that with cotemporary historians, there may be an apparent contradiction, and the credit of both parties remain as entire and unsuspicious as before. Posterity is in these cases disposed to make the most liberal allowances. Instead of calling it a contradiction, they often call it a difficulty. They are sensible, that, in many instances, a seeming variety of statement has, upon a more extensive knowledge of ancient history, admitted of a perfect reconciliation. Instead, therefore, of referring the difficulty in question to the inaccuracy or bad faith of any of the parties, they, with more justness, and more modesty, refer it to their own ignorance, and to that obscurity which necessarily hangs over the history of every remote age. These principles are suffered to have great influence in every secular investigation; but so soon as, instead

of a secular, it becomes a sacred investigation, every ordinary principle is abandoned, and the suspicion annexed to the teachers of religion is carried to the dereliction of all that candour and liberality with which every other document of antiquity is judged of and appreciated. How does it happen that the authority of Josephus should be acquiesced in as a first principle, while every step in the narrative of the Evangelists, must have foreign testimony to confirm and support it? How comes it, that the silence of Josephus should be construed into an impeachment of the testimony of the Evangelists, while it is never admitted for a single moment, that the silence of the Evangelists can impart the slightest blemish to the testimony of Josephus? How comes it, that the supposition of two Philips in one family should throw a damp of scepticism over the gospel narrative, while the only circumstance which renders that supposition necessary, is the single testimony of Josephus; in which very testimony it is necessarily implied, that there were two Herods in that same family? How comes it, that the Evangelists, with as much internal, and a vast deal more of external evidence in their favour, should be made to stand before Josephus, like so many prisoners at the bar of justice? In any other case, we are convinced that this would be looked upon as *rough handling*. But we are not sorry for it: it has given more triumph and confidence to the argument. And it is no small addition to our faith, that its first teachers have survived an examination, which, in point of rigour, and severity, we believe to be quite unexampled in the annals of criticism.' pp. 68—74.

It is a circumstance on which the Christian must reflect with high satisfaction, and the unbeliever with dismay, that even imagination cannot conceive of any thing calculated to give strength to testimony, which is not found in the original witnesses for the religion of Christ. Whether they turn their attention to the nature of the facts attested,—the scene of their exhibition,—the state of the world at the time,—the character of the witnesses,—their number,—the manner in which they have given their evidence,—the peculiar circumstances under which they were placed,—or the effects produced;—every where, the one will find guarantees for his faith and hope, and the other, new causes for alarm. There are three things particularly which enable a disciple of the New Testament to challenge the world to produce an instance of any remote fact better attested than the object of his faith. These circumstances are, *first*, the impossibility that the witnesses should be mistaken respecting *what* they declared; *secondly*, that no probable motive, except the conviction of truth, can be assigned, *why* they should declare it; and, *thirdly*, their voluntary exposure of themselves, if not faithful, to certain detection, disgrace, and ruin, in the manner—*how* they chose to make that declaration. They announced what they saw, heard, and felt; this they did

at the peril of their property, their fame, their liberty, their lives; and that too accompanied with appeals to hundreds of other witnesses besides themselves then living, and all capable of denying and exposing their assertions, if false.

‘Infidelity on the rack for conjectures to give plausibility to its system,’ may affirm that, ‘the glory of establishing a new religion induced the first Christians to persist in asserting a falsehood. But it is forgotten, that we have the concurrence of two parties to the truth of Christianity, and that it is the conduct only of one of the parties, which can be accounted for by the supposition in question. The two parties are, the teachers and the taught. The former may aspire to the glory of founding a new faith; but what glory did the latter propose to themselves from being the dupes of an imposition so ruinous to every earthly interest, and held in such low and disgraceful estimation by the world at large? There may be a glory in leading, but we see no glory in being led. Had Christianity been false, the reputation of its first teachers, lay at the mercy of every individual among the numerous proselytes which they had gained to their system. It may not be competent for an unlettered peasant to detect the absurdity of a doctrine; but he can at all times lift his testimony against a fact, said to have happened in his presence, and under the observation of his senses. Now it so happens, that in a number of the Epistles, there are allusions to, or express intimations of, the miracles that had been wrought in the different Churches to which these Epistles are addressed. How comes it, if it be all a fabrication, that it was never exposed? We know that some of the disciples were driven, by the terrors of persecuting violence, to resign their profession. How should it happen that none of them ever attempted to vindicate their apostacy, by laying open the artifice and insincerity of their Christian teachers? We may be sure that such a testimony would have been highly acceptable to the existing authorities of that period. The Jews would have made the most of it; and the vigilant and discerning officers of the Roman government would not have failed to turn it to account. The mystery would have been exposed and laid open, and the curiosity of latter ages would have been satisfied as to the wonderful and unaccountable steps, by which a religion could make such head in the world, though it rested its whole authority on facts, the falsehood of which was accessible to all who were at the trouble to enquire about them. But no! We hear of no such testimony from the apostates of that period. We read of some, who, agonized at the reflection of their treachery, returned to their first profession, and expiated, by martyrdom, the guilt which they felt they had incurred by their dereliction of the truth. This furnishes a strong example of the power of conviction, and when we join with it, that it is conviction in the integrity of those teachers who appealed to miracles which had been wrought among them, it appears to us a testimony in favour of our religion which is altogether irresistible.’ pp. 98—101.

In considering subsequent testimonies the writer of the work before us abounds in just and striking observations. His clouds of witnesses present themselves in a long and well compacted line. Converts to Christianity, by the circumstance of their conversion, have before been made to furnish powerful corroboration of its truth, but as evidence they were never so successfully summoned, and so fairly brought into court. There is a vivacity of effect arising from the resuscitation of the innumerable dead, and the giving to each of a voice to speak for the cause in behalf of which he died, which the abstract argument from the general success of Christianity cannot produce. The early disciples of Christ no longer make their appearance in a crowd, but come separately forward and distinctly give their testimony. That the numbers who early forsook Paganism and Judaism for the religion of the Cross, were very great, the enemies of that religion will not venture to deny. The fact is too well attested by their favourite witnesses to allow of doubt; for whatever suspicions might rest on the testimony of LUKE or of PAUL, they will certainly give credit to TACITUS and PLINY. Now, except it can be believed, that all these persons acted without motive, and in entire abandonment of the strongest principles of human nature, they must be regarded as so many distinct witnesses to the truth of what they embraced, and as witnesses worthy of the most undoubting confidence; for at the time they lived, it was necessary only to make inquiry, in order to ascertain the truth or the falsehood of those facts, on the evidence of which they were called upon to renounce the religion of their fathers.

It has been said, that the Jews, among whom those facts occurred, would have believed, had they been true. This remark, observes Mr. Chalmers, arises from a mere sophism, by which the objectors delude themselves. A change of name is mistaken for difference of person. Numbers of Jews did believe, but being distinguished no longer as Jews, they mingled with the mass of Christians. Thus the unbelief of some Jews is seized upon as evidence against Christianity, but the belief of others is not allowed as evidence for it; because, by believing, and thus becoming Christians, they necessarily ceased to be regarded as Jews. But of what advantage would have been the belief even of that whole people? Would this have accredited Christianity in the mind of the infidel? Why should their embracing Christianity, have proved to such an objector the miracles of Christianity, more than their receiving the institutions of Moses, the miracles recorded by Moses? Had the whole nation believed in Christ, it would doubtless have been regarded as little as their faith in Moses. Circumstances sufficiently

numerous, from their credulity, their expectations, and their wishes, would have been urged to account for it. But as it is, the fact is just such as to give the greatest strength to proof. Part rejected Christ, and part received him. The violent prejudices against him, rendered the most powerful facts necessary, and the instances in which those prejudices were overcome, evince that those facts were powerful. The unbelief of the many rendered the faith of the few more tried, and therefore a stronger test of truth.

On the objection that Christian miracles are not attested by heathen writers, and particularly that the resurrection of Christ is not recorded in their histories of those times, Mr. Chalmers remarks,

‘It is most improbable that a testimony of this kind would have been given, even though the resurrection of Jesus Christ be admitted; and, therefore, the want of this testimony carries in it no argument that the resurrection is a falsehood. If, however, in opposition to all probability, this testimony had been given, it would have been appealed to as a most striking confirmation of the main fact of the evangelical history. It would have figured away in all our elementary treatises, and been referred to as a master argument in every exposition of the evidences of Christianity. Infidels would have been challenged to believe in it on the strength of their own favourite evidence, the evidence of a classical historian; and must have been at a loss how to dispose of this fact, when they saw an unbiassed heathen giving his round and unqualified testimony in its favour. Let us now carry the supposition a step farther. Let us conceive that Tacitus not only believed the fact, and gave his testimony to it, but that he believed it so far as to become a Christian. Is his testimony to be refused, because he gives this evidence of its sincerity? Tacitus asserting the fact and remaining a heathen, is not so strong an argument for the truth of our Saviour’s resurrection, as Tacitus asserting the fact, and becoming a Christian in consequence of it. Yet the moment that this transition is made—a transition by which, in point of fact, his testimony becomes stronger—in point of impression it becomes less; and by a delusion common to the infidel and the believer, the argument is held to be weakened by the very circumstance which imparts greater force to it. The elegant and accomplished scholar becomes a believer. The truth, the novelty, the importance of this new subject, withdraw him from every other pursuit. He shares in the common enthusiasm of the cause, and gives all his talents and eloquence to the support of it. Instead of the Roman historian, Tacitus comes down to posterity in the shape of a Christian Father, and the high authority of his name is lost in a crowd of similar testimonies.’ pp. 131, 132.

Though our Author employs his chief attention on that part of the Christian evidences, which ultimately rests on

miracles, yet he has presented to us some very judicious remarks on prophecy. The argument founded on the accomplishment of prediction, is, indeed, not inferior to that deduced from testimony, but our Author despairs of inducing the sceptical, at the outset of inquiry, to examine, with sufficient attention, a book against which they indulge so great an antipathy. He selects, however, an instance or two, which he thinks, might, *prima facie*, conciliate so much regard as to secure a patient attention to others, from which hardly must be the infidelity that can without compunction turn away.

Having discussed the positive proof of Christianity, the writer of this interesting volume, takes notice of different classes of its enemies. With much acuteness, and in the true spirit of philosophy, he first exposes the hasty, superficial, and unscientific inferences of *sceptical* Geologists. These gentlemen, who would make us believe that they 'know the age of the world better than he who made it,' might find, would they reflect a little, that, even admitting their premises, their favourite conclusion would not so certainly follow as they hope; and we fear that, with many of them, this would very much diminish the interest of their researches and speculations. The diversities of opinion among Geologists themselves, shew, that the Mosaic account of the Creation is as worthy of credit at least as theirs, even should the ancient prophet and the modern philosopher be found irreconcilable; but it does not clearly appear, that there is opposition between them. The narration of the one, is not perhaps at all affected by the speculations of the other.

'Does Moses ever say, that when God created the heavens and the earth, he did more at the time alluded to than transform them out of previously existing materials? Or does he ever say that there was not an interval of many ages betwixt the first act of creation, described in the first verse of the book of Genesis, and said to have been performed at the *beginning*, and those more detailed operations, the account of which commences at the second verse, and which are described to us as having been performed in so many days? Or, finally, does he ever make us to understand, that the genealogies of man went any farther than to fix the antiquity of the species, and, of consequence, that they left the antiquity of the globe a free subject for the speculations of philosophers? We do not pledge ourselves for the truth of one or all of these suppositions. Nor is it necessary that we should. It is enough that any of them is infinitely more rational than the rejection of Christianity in the face of its historical evidence.' pp. 184, 185.

The section in which the Author considers the infidel's objections from internal evidence, is written with great elegance,

vivacity, and force. Many parts of it are highly finished and beautiful; yet as an argument its effect, is, on the whole, weakened, we think, for want of a clearer method and some useful distinctions. On this account there is even a slight appearance of contradiction between the recommendation and the censure, so that the mind feels for a moment as if it were suddenly called upon to abandon what had but just before been impressed upon its attention. It is as if the Author were at one time urging the necessity of taking experience alone for our guide, and then guarding us against its treachery. His design, however, was not to shake our confidence in this excellent conductor, but only to caution against a partial and inadequate attention to its dictates. When the infidel argues in opposition to the statements of Scripture, from his views of the character of God, he will not admit that he is renouncing experience, for he professes to have formed those views from observed fact. His error therefore, philosophically considered, consists, not in rejecting the Baconian system, but in an incautious application of its principles. His conclusions are founded on an observation too limited and partial. On the whole, we think Mr. C. in making it exclusive, has carried his admiration of the experimental system somewhat too far. Its success in physics, its peculiar province, has occasioned a treatment of other evidence, even in other departments, rather too contemptuous. The tendency towards excess on this subject has been justly remarked by Mr. Dugald Stewart, in his last work. Where it applies, the method of induction from experimentally-ascertained fact, is doubtless the safest and the best. It is in such cases the only philosophical one. But there are occasions and topics concerning which we are called upon to judge, where it cannot be legitimately resorted to. The geometrical, and the algebraic sciences, are not founded on experiment, nor are the *laws* of morality, or the *doctrines* of revealed religion; at least, in any such sense of the term as is understood in physics. Had the Author, therefore, confined his argument to the proof of a Revelation, which proof rests upon facts intimately connected with the physical constitution of the world;—facts which addressed themselves to the senses, and which therefore are the proper objects of experience, the argument would have had more compactness and force. It needed not to be stretched indefinitely to embrace every object of inquiry, and exclude from all every other medium of proof. The evidence of one class of truths, relating to the operations both of matter and mind, rests on sense and consciousness; that of another, on demonstration; and that of a third, on Divine revelation. Divine testimony clearly fur-

nishes a distinct law of belief, for though it is by induction from observed fact, that we come to know that the Deity *has* spoken to man, yet the *truths* which he has declared, rest not on human experience, but on the notion of Divine veracity, essential to the idea of God.

But though these remarks appear to us to be called for by the too indefinite manner in which the Author has expressed himself, yet they do not in the least diminish the force of his reasoning so far as the object he had in view is concerned. As it cannot be questioned, that in investigating the fact of our having a revelation, the philosophical method of inquiry is the experimental one, his admirably pointed censure of the infidel, remains for that infidel to rebut if he can. We had marked several energetic and happily expressed passages from this part of the work for quotation, but our limits oblige us to forbear.

After his masterly appeal to deistical infidels, the Author addresses himself to the atheist; and proposes, with great simplicity and effect, the argument which testimony presents for the being of a God.

The conclusion of the work is on Scripture authority, and will not be read without high gratification, both from the beauty of its diction, and the excellence of its design. The evils of which it complains are so great and indisputable; the manner in which they are characterized is so lively and discriminating; the general sentiment opposed to them so just and important; and the composition, with the exception of a few Scotticisms, so striking and elegant, that we never felt more inclined to give unqualified praise. If, however, the whole is to be regarded as sober reasoning, and no part as oratorical freedom, we are compelled to admit that in combating one error, there is an appearance of sanctioning another. There is a certain extravagant amplitude in some of the Author's positions, and a bold and sweeping compass in his language, better calculated for vivid effect, than for calm and critical reflection. There is a confounding of reason with mere sophism, opinion, fancy, speculation, taste; and while he justly condemns the latter in Theology, he seems unjustly to interdict the former. It is not reason which leads us to form maxims contrary to Scripture, to reject revealed mysteries, or to judge without evidence, and therefore in our censure of such conduct we ought not to libel reason by involving it in our blame. When the Author goes the length, not only of making the decisions of Scripture primary, paramount, final, as they really are, but of making the silence also of Scripture equally authoritative;—when he

asserts that we are not only to renounce whatever is contrary to it, but that we are absolutely to have no sentiment but what it definitively settles;—when he silences the voice of the heavens, and commands the things that are made, no longer to proclaim the power and Godhead of their maker;—when he renounces natural theology as vain and false, and excludes reason from any share of exercise in interpreting revealed theology;—we hesitate to accompany him. We cannot allow that Christianity is a mere matter of philology;—that the grammar and lexicon are the only assistances we need, and that he who translates well, must necessarily be an accomplished divine. There must be the knowledge of things, as well as the knowledge of words;—the employment of reason as well as the application of grammar: without the latter the former has no support; and without the former, the latter is of little use. Mere grammar would produce popery, contradiction, inanity; but grammar, united with sound analogy, produces harmony and truth. Nor is the Scripture, in requiring this aid, peculiar; for we cannot agree with our Author, that the grammar and lexicon have settled the doctrines of Aristotle and Epicurus; and in proof of our opinion we need only refer to the various expositions of their philosophy. To renounce the assistance of reason is not the way to establish the authority of Scripture; nor in order to receive the testimony of revelation respecting Christ, is it necessary to reject that of the stars and seasons respecting God.

On the whole, we greatly admire this little volume, and most heartily recommend it to the perusal of all who feel an interest in that Christianity which it so ably defends. To those who have doubts respecting the evidence of revealed religion, it may render essential service; and to those who have no specific fears to compose, it must still supply a source of high gratification, for we cannot too surely ascertain the strength of that vessel in which we embark our all. The style is unusually dissimilar, sometimes descending to colloquial familiarity, and sometimes rising to the sublime; without effort, but full of beauty: it is, in short, that of a powerful and cultivated mind, but of a mind so absorbed in its subject, as to be inattentive to artificial ornament, and, sometimes, even to correctness.

Art. IV. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, for the Year 1813. Part II. 4to. price 18s. G. and W. Nicol, London, 1814.*

I. *An Account of some Organic Remains found near Brentford, Middlesex.* By the late Mr. William Kirby Trimmer. Communicated in a Letter from Mr. James R. Trimmer, to the Right Hon. Sir Joseph Banks, Bart. K. B. P. R. S.

THE remains which are described in this communication, were found by the late Mr. Trimmer, in digging for clay for the manufacture of bricks and tiles. They were found in two separate but not contiguous fields, both situated on the north bank of the Thames. The site of the first is about half a mile north of the river at Kew-bridge, the elevation being about 25 feet above its level at low water. Mr. T. enumerates five strata, the lowest of which is the thick bed of blue clay which appears to extend under London and its vicinity, and the average thickness of which is about two hundred feet where the surface is level, but thicker under the hills. The uppermost stratum is the only one which is entirely destitute of organic remains. The second contains only the shells of snails and river fish, with inconsiderable fragments of the bones of land animals. The third contains, besides the same description of shells, the bones and horns of the ox, and horns, bones, and teeth of the deer. In the fourth stratum were found the teeth and bones of both the African and the Asiatic elephant, the teeth of the hippopotamus, and the bones, horns, and teeth of the ox. The stratum of clay was penetrated in this situation to the depth of about thirty feet only, and the fossil remains observed in it were entirely marine, with the exception of some pieces of petrified wood and fruit. They were found dispersed without any regularity, and consisted chiefly of the shells of the oyster, *pinnae marinae*, *nautili*, the bones and teeth of fish, and a considerable variety of small marine shells.

The second field is situated about a mile further west than the former, and a mile north of the river, its elevation being about forty feet above the river at low water. The first stratum in this situation is also without any organic remains. In the lower portion of the second the remains of the elephant, the hippopotamus, of several species of deer, and of the ox, were extremely abundant. In turning over an area of one hundred and twenty yards, parts of six tusks of the hippopotamus were found, besides remains of the other ani-

mals already mentioned. Among these the horn of an ox measured four feet and a half following the curve, and was five inches in diameter at the root. Mr. Trimmer remarks that the gravel stones in this stratum do not appear to have been rounded in the usual way by attrition; and that the bones must have been deposited after the muscular parts of the animal were destroyed, because in no instance were those bones which are connected together in the living animal, found lying contiguous to each other. Some beautiful engravings are given of objects described in the paper.

X. *On a new Construction of a Condenser and Air-pump.*

By the Rev. Gilbert Austin. In a Letter to Sir Humphrey Davy, LL. D. F. R. S.

We must refer such of our readers, who wish to become acquainted with this instrument, to the original communication, which is accompanied with explanatory figures, without the aid of which we should despair of making any account of it intelligible.

XXI. *On the Formation of Fat in the Intestines of living Animals.* By Sir Everard Home, Bart. Presented by the Society for promoting the Knowledge of Animal Chemistry.

We have seldom met, in the Transactions of the Royal Society, with a communication of so hypothetical a character as this. It is an attempt to establish the conclusion that the formation of animal fat is a process carried on in the large intestines, and that it is conveyed from thence by means of the absorbent and sanguiferous system of vessels, to the various parts of the body where it is found deposited. The Author informs us that this opinion was suggested to his mind, in the course of his inquiry into the digestive organs of different animals, and more especially from observing the remarkable difference in the length of the large intestines in some animals which occupy situations on the globe, which are more or less favourable to the abundant supply of food. The facts and analogies which Sir E. adduces in support of his hypothesis, are the following: the conversion of the muscular parts of the animal body into the fatty matter called adipocire, under water, and in some burying grounds, a recent example of which is noticed as having occurred in the church-yard of Shoreditch; the occurrence of the substance called ambergris, in the large intestines of the spermarceti whale; the scybala met with in the human in-

testine in some conditions of disease, and which Sir E. asserts are in all respects similar to ambergris; and the formation of concretions, consisting of oil and animal mucus, in a case of severe stomach affection, which was considered as originating in the irritation of biliary calculi, and for which pretty considerable quantities of olive oil were taken by the patient.

This fact appears as a communication from Dr Babington, as does also another of pure animal fat being discharged from the intestines of a child of three years old, at intervals of ten or fourteen days, and in the quantity of several ounces at each period. In addition to this evidence, Sir E. brings forward the result of experiments which were instituted with a view to obtain a farther confirmation of his opinion. An attempt was made to procure fat from the contents of the colon in different parts of its course, but without success; the contents of the lower intestine of a duck, the evacuations of which had been suspended for seven days, were next examined, but no fat was procured, except from a portion of the contents of the cæcum which was macerated in a dilute solution of nitric acid. Portions of muscular fibre were digested in oil, both of the human subject and the ox. At the temperature of 100° , some fatty matter was formed upon the surface, and the fecal odour was perceived on the fourth day. No fat was formed at the temperature of 60° , and in one of the experiments at 100° , in which the putrefaction process was rather advanced, no traces of fat could be detected. A small film of fatty matter was obtained by macerating a fecal evacuation which had been passed after a constipation of six days. And finally, the case of a child is adduced, which lived several months but without growth, and without any fat being deposited under the skin, and in which, after death, the gall bladder was found to be wanting, nor was there any duct from the liver to the intestinal canal.

Sir Everard thinks that all this affords a sufficient body of evidence in proof of his opinion, that the formation of animal fat takes place in the large intestines. In our judgment the evidence appears to be singularly defective, and the conclusion, hasty and unphilosophical. To say nothing of the obvious importance of great extent of the large intestines, to those animals which may be supposed to be unfavourably situated in regard to the abundant supply of food, as affording an extensive surface for the absorbents;—in what way we would ask can the formation of concretions, from the combination of oil taken into the stomach with

the mucus of the intestinal canal, afford either direct or direct evidence of the conversion of the alimentary matter in the large intestines into fat? Or what analogy can there be between the conversion of dead animal muscle into fat, a process which takes place at a low temperature, and so slow as to require years for its completion, and a change which can take place in the alimentary canal of a living animal, in which the food is urged forward with so much rapidity, when the functions are properly performed as to pass through the whole length of the intestines in a few hours, perhaps twenty-four at the utmost.

As to the conclusions drawn from the experiments which Sir E. caused to be made, they appear to us to be very far from being correct and satisfactory deductions, for we cannot find that the results exhibited that regularity and uniformity which are necessary to justify so positive a conclusion. But even supposing we were authorized to draw this inference with respect to the changes which alimentary matter, derived from the animal kingdom, might undergo, what proofs or examples have we of this conversion having been effected out of the body on vegetable matter? And would not the difficulty remain as great as ever consequently with respect to animals subsisting wholly on vegetable food? Sir E. remarks that this theory recommended itself to his adoption the more strongly, because there is no other mode which he is acquainted, by which animal fat can be formed. We are far from thinking that he has proved it to be formed in this way in the animal body, and we would ask what greater difficulty there can be in referring its formation to the general process of secretion, than that of bone, or muscle, or than the bile, the saliva, or any other of the secretory fluids, except that in the one case we can see the apparatus by which the function is performed, and in the other we cannot, for the means by which the function is performed is, in both cases equally unknown to us.

XXII. *On the Colouring Matter of the Black Bronchial Glands, and of the Black Spots of the Lungs.*
George Pearson, M.D. F.R.S.

The colour of the Lungs undergoes a remarkable change in the human subject in the progress from infancy to age, but the fact though too obvious to have been at any time overlooked, has not been examined in reference to its immediate cause. This object has been attempted by Dr. Pearson in the present communication, which bears the appearance of considerable labour having been expended in the investigation

subjecting detached bronchial glands, or portions of the substance of the lungs, which were thickly studded with black points or congeries of lines, to the action of caustic potash in solution, or the more active acids, such as the nitric, or muriatic acids, the organized animal substance was dissolved, and a black powder was obtained, to which the colour of the part was owing, and which, being insoluble, subsided to the bottom of the vessel. This black powder, when subjected to the action of the nitrat, or oxymuriate of potash, flagrated as charcoal does, and afforded carbonic acid. When heated alone, it burned with the odour of animal matter, and afforded a portion of animal empyreumatic oil, and there was also a production of hydro-carbonate gas, and a trace of prussic acid. Dr. P. therefore concludes, that this colouring matter is an uncombined animal charcoal, or, as he expresses it, 'not existing as a constituent ingredient of organized animal solids or fluids.' With respect to its origin he appears to us to have adopted a theory which is neither very ingenious, nor much in correspondence to any physiological view of the functions of these important organs. He thinks it is introduced with the air which we breathe, and that it is consequently absorbed from the air cells, by the vessels which open upon their surface.

This is a very mechanical view of the subject, and if it were the real source, we should naturally expect to find the change of colour gradually going on from the commencement of life to its close, which is contrary to our experience of its progress. We have observed it in a very high degree in comparatively young subjects who have fallen victims to consumption. Besides, when we consider that the pulmonary organs are the great outlets by which carbon is thrown out of the system, such an opinion seems hardly reconcileable with their known structure and purposes in the animal economy. It appears more probable that it takes place as a consequence of the function of the lungs being less perfectly performed, either as the effect of disease, or of that gradual change which, though not disease, is connected with the less vigorous performance of all the functions, which is a condition of advancing life. An inquiry into the relative proportions of carbonic acid given out at different periods of life, might throw some light upon it. We should have supposed that the notion of the oxygen of the air passing through the coats of the air cells and into the pulmonary vessels, was exploded since the publication of Mr. Ellis's ingenious and able inquiry, if Dr. P. had not brought it forward on this occasion, as a support to his theory. The fact

noticed by Dr. P. that the colouring matter is not removed by ablution, nor by maceration in water, is, we think, adverse to the idea of its being simply an extraneous matter, taken up by the absorbents.

XXIII. Experiments on the Alcohol of Sulphur, or Sulphuret of Carbon. By J. Berzelius, M. D. F. R. S. Professor of Chemistry at Stockholm; and Alexander Martin, M. D. F. R. S. One of the Physicians to Guy's Hospital.

This able and elaborate paper is arranged under four divisions, the first of which relates to the preparation and general properties of this singular compound; the second details experiments made to determine whether hydrogen is one of its constituent principles; the third refers to the presence of carbon; and the fourth, to the proportion of its elements.

The preparation was conducted on the plan recommended by Clement and Desormes, viz. by volatilizing sulphur, through charcoal heated to redness in a porcelain tube, and condensing the product in water. The fluid thus obtained is of a pale yellow colour, extremely volatile, and producing a great degree of cold during its evaporation, and depositing in a crystalline form sulphur which is held in solution. To procure it perfectly pure it is necessary to distil it at a temperature not exceeding 110° . It is perfectly transparent and colourless, with a pungent taste and fetid smell. It boils under the ordinary atmospheric pressure at between 105° and 110° and does not congeal at the temperature of 60° below zero. It is highly inflammable, burns with a blue flame, and emits copious fumes of sulphureous acid. It is readily soluble in alcohol and ether, and is precipitated from its solution in alcohol by the addition of water. It is not soluble in water. It combines readily and perfectly with either the fixed or the volatile oils, and dissolves camphor rapidly. No action is exhibited with potassium when in the liquid state, but in the gaseous form, the potassium becomes ignited, and emits a reddish flame, and a black film is deposited upon its surface. When water is introduced, a greenish solution is obtained, having the properties of sulphuret of potash, and in which some carbonaceous matter is suspended. It has no action on mercury, or on the amalgam of silver or of lead. The alkalis dissolve it, but none of the acids except the nitro-muriatic, and the oxymuriatic gas in a humid state have any action upon it. It combines with the new detonating compound lately described by Sir H. Davy, and the compound formed by their union does not explode when heated to ignition, nor does it exhibit any action when brought into

contact with olive oil. It also prevents the detonation of compound when brought into contact with phosphorus, if the quantity of the detonating compound predominates, the mixture inflames.

The experiments which were to determine the question of hydrogen being contained in this liquid as one of its constituent parts, were made with oxygen, oxymuriatic gas, nitrate of silver heated to redness, and different metallic plates strongly heated, through which it was passed in a state of vapour, and the results were such as to afford sufficient proof, that no hydrogen entered into its composition. The experiments instituted for the purpose of ascertaining carbon was contained in it, as one of its essential constituent parts, were perfectly decisive in their results. The gaseous matter, produced by its combustion in very pure oxygen, was found to be a mixture of sulphureous acid gas, of carbonic acid gas, and of gaseous oxide of carbon; and when it was combined with the solutions of lime and barytes in water, carbonic acid was slowly formed, and occasioned precipitation of the earths from the solutions. The determination of the proportions in which the sulphur and the carbon are combined in this body, was attended with some difficulty; but its perfect decomposition was ultimately effected, slowly passing it in a state of vapour through the red oxide of iron coarsely pulverized. By a very careful analysis conducted in this manner, it was ascertained to contain 84. 83 parts of sulphur and 15. 17 of carbon in the 100 or 100 sulphur and 17. 89 carbon. These proportions correspond so nearly to numbers which, on Dalton's principles, represent these substances respectively, that there can be no reasonable doubt of the truth of the conclusion which the excellent chemists have drawn, that it consists of two atoms of sulphur united to one of carbon.

There is an Appendix to this communication by Professor Berzelius, which exhibits the characteristic proofs of his profound knowledge of chemical science. It relates to several points connected with the subject of the paper, or arising from it.

The Professor first relates the details of the mode which he pursued to ascertain the elementary proportions of the compound; he then compares these results with the deductions obtained by the application of the law of definite proportions, and offers some general observations on the atomic theory.

The remaining portion is occupied with an account of some combinations of the sulphuret of carbon with the alkalies,

earths, and metallic oxides; (a class of bodies for which he proposes the name of carbo-sulphurets;) and a new compound produced by the action of nitro-muriatic acid. The carbo-sulphurets appear to exist as distinct compounds only so long only as water is totally excluded, for its presence occasions their decomposition when a hydro-sulphuret of the base is formed, carbonic acid being at the same time produced. The substance formed by the action of nitro-muriatic acid and sulphuret of carbon, presents many singular properties. It is a solid white crystalline body, having the appearance of camphor; fusible at a low temperature, very volatile, and subliming without residuum. It is insoluble in water, but dissolves readily in alcohol and ether, from which it is precipitated by water, and it forms transparent solutions in both the fixed and volatile oils. It reddens litmus paper, and dissolves zinc with the disengagement of a very fetid gas; and from this solution a spirituous liquid is procured by distillation, having the same smell with the gas, and there is a residuum of sulphur and muriate of zinc. Its solution in alcohol, when distilled, affords sulphureous acid gas, alcohol strongly impregnated with muriatic ether, and carbonic acid gas. Water has the power of decomposing it, though very slowly. Caustic potash in solution, aided by heat, dissolves it, without any disengagement of gas, and when the potash is neutralized by sulphuric acid, no precipitation takes place, but there is a slight efflorescence, and the smell of sulphureous acid. The addition of sulphate of silver occasions the precipitation of the muriate of that metal. It contains therefore sulphur and carbon in combination with oxygen, and consequently in the state of sulphureous and carbonic acids, for otherwise either carbon would have been precipitated, or sulphuret or hydro-sulphuret of potash formed.

Professor B. estimates its composition at 48. 74 muriatic acid, 29. 63 sulphureous acid, and 21. 63 carbonic acid with loss; or, on the atomic theory of Dalton, it is composed of 10 atoms of muriatic acid, one of sulphureous, and one of carbonic acid. It is remarkable, Dr. B. observes, that the proportions of sulphur and carbon which it contains, are the same with those of the sulphuret of carbon, for one of the atoms of sulphur is expelled during the formation of the triple acid, and is converted into sulphuric acid, which is found in the nitro-muriatic solution. To this singular compound the Professor gives the name of acidum-muriaticum-sulphuroso-carbonicum, which, though objectionable on account of its length, is certainly in conformity with the established principle of chemical nomenclature.

XXIV. On the Means of procuring a steady Light in Coal Mines, without the Danger of Explosion. By William Reid Clanny, M.D. of Sunderland. Communicated by William Allen, Esq. F.R.S.

The many melancholy accidents which have happened in consequence of the explosion of the carburetted hydrogen gas, which accumulates in coal mines, gives a peculiar interest to every proposal, which has for its object, to render the situation of the miners less hazardous, while they are following their dangerous occupations. The power of ventilation seems to be unequal to the purpose of averting the danger in the working of an extensive mine; and Dr. Clanny has therefore suggested an apparatus, in which the light that enables the workman to pursue his labours, is placed in an insulated atmosphere, so that any explosion which takes place is limited to the atmosphere contained in the apparatus. The connexion of the air within the apparatus, with the external atmosphere, is cut off by means of two reservoirs containing water, and the air is forced through the water in the lower reservoir, by means of a pair of bellows, and the air which has already contributed to support the combustion of the lamp or candle, is consequently forced through a tube or chimney at the top, and, in its escape, passes through the water contained in the upper reservoir. The contrivance is simple and may be readily managed, and we trust its general adoption will prevent the recurrence of those heart rending calamities that have so frequently involved the population of the coal districts in a state of affliction and wretchedness extremely distressing to contemplate, especially in connexion with the painful pursuits of laborious industry.

XXVI. Additional Observations on the Effects of Magnesia in preventing an increased Formation of Uric Acid; with Remarks on the Influence of Acids upon the Composition of Urine. By William Thomas Brande, F.R.S., Prof. Chem. R. I. Communicated by the Society for improving Animal Chemistry. —

This is an important communication, inasmuch as it extends our knowledge of the means of relieving or preventing one of the most painful maladies to which the human body is liable. Mr. B. in his former communication on this subject, noticed the power which magnesia has in correcting the disposition to the formation of uric acid, a substance of which urinary calculi are

frequently formed, and which, in many instances, is found to constitute the central nucleus of those which are formed of the ammoniaco-magnesian phosphates. To possess the means, therefore, of preventing its formation, is of singular importance, since we may thus be enabled, in many instances, to avert the contingent necessity of submitting to a painful and dangerous operation.

Mr. B. has related two cases, in this paper, in which the daily use of magnesia for some time, was followed by an entire disappearance of the deposit of uric acid, an effect which alkaline remedies had, in both instances, failed to produce. There is also this important advantage connected with the employment of magnesia, that it does not injure the powers of the stomach, which the alkalies, especially in their pure state, generally do, if taken for any length of time. The incautious or improper use of either of these remedies, after the uric acid has ceased to be deposited, is attended, however, in some instances, with inconveniences, which are different in kind only, and not in the degree of danger, from that which they are intended to remove; for when the formation of uric acid is corrected, the urine, in these cases, deposits a sediment of white sand, consisting of the ammoniaco-magnesian phosphates, either alone, or mixed with the phosphate of lime; nor is the appearance of this sediment peculiar to these circumstances.

Dr. Wollaston some years ago suggested the employment of acid remedies, with a view to remove the formation of this kind of deposit; and Mr. Brande has successfully applied himself to the investigation of this important inquiry. He found that the mineral acids occasion the re-appearance of the uric acid, in cases where it had been previously suspended by the use of magnesia; and, in others, to cause considerable irritation to the bladder, or the intestines; he was therefore induced to try the effect of vegetable acids, and the results are peculiarly satisfactory. Fifteen or twenty grains of citric acid, taken twice or thrice a day, soon produced a marked diminution of the earthy deposit, and the continuance of it for some months, caused it to disappear entirely.

In the case of a gentleman, eighty years of age, who, together with the deposit of the white sediment and mucus, had symptoms of diseased prostate gland, and had twice submitted to the operation for the stone, even the citric acid was found to be inadmissible, in consequence of the irritation which it occasioned, when it was taken in sufficient quantity to produce any change in the appearance of the urine. In this case carbonic acid was employed with the happiest effect. The quantity of this acid which is disengaged from thirty grains of crystal

lized carbonate of potash, was taken four or five times a day, and, during its employment, the urine ceased to deposite any sediment, and the irritability of the bladder subsided.

XXVII. *Additions to an Account of the Anatomy of the Squalus Maximus, contained in a former Paper; with Observations on the Branchial Artery.* By Sir Everard Home, Bart. F.A.S.

An opportunity having occurred of examining an individual of this species of *Squalus*, in consequence of one having been brought to London in 1812, Sir E. has availed himself of it, to correct his former account of its anatomical structure, which was drawn up from an examination of one which was a good deal mutilated. The principal parts which are noticed in this communication, are, the stomach, the biliary ducts, the heart, the sexual organs, and the brain; and the peculiarities of structure are illustrated by some very beautiful engravings of the parts.

The muscular structure of the branchial artery, which, Sir E. remarks, is confined to particular tribes of fish, he supposes to be intended to regulate the supply of blood to the gills. In those fish which frequent deep water, he thinks the pressure of the water will be so much increased or diminished by the depth at which the fish may be from the surface, that the circulation of the blood in the branchiæ must undergo corresponding changes, and consequently will require a regulating force which shall vary with the situation of the animal. When the fish is in deep water, the contraction of the muscular coat will diminish the area of the artery, and by causing the valves to act perfectly in concert, will force the blood into the capillary vessels, but when the animal is near the surface, the relaxation of this structure will permit the regurgitation of the blood into the ventricle, so that the vessels of the gills may not be too much loaded with blood.

This muscularity of the branchial artery is common to all the shark tribe. It is confined to particular genera, however, and Sir E. illustrates his ideas of the purposes which this structure is intended to answer, by comparing it with others in which the branchial artery is extremely elastic, but entirely destitute of muscular fibres. This occurs in the turbot, which, living at a moderate depth in the sea, is subject to little variation in the pressure made upon the gills; and in fishes of this description, elasticity is employed as a substitute for muscular power. But in addition to these means of regulating the circulation of blood in the gills, the ventricle, in most fishes, is so situated in respect to the auricle, that the blood re-

ceived into it, is, in the first instance, impelled in a direction nearly at angles to that of the artery.

XXVIII. *Some further Observations on a new detonating Substance.* In a Letter from Sir Humphrey Davy, LL.D. F.R.S. V.P.R.I. to the Right Hon. Sir Joseph Banks, Bart. K.B. P.R.S.

Since the communication of his former paper on the properties of this new substance, Sir. H. has had the satisfaction to learn, that the compound which he had formed and examined, was the same with that which had been discovered at Paris. The present communication details the results of additional experiments upon it, made with a view to the farther investigation of its properties, and the proportion of its constituent parts. Its specific gravity is 1,653. It does not become solid when exposed to the cold produced by a mixture of ice and muriate of lime. It gradually disappears in water, azotic gas being evolved, and the water acquiring the taste and the smell of a weak solution of nitro-muriatic acid. When introduced into concentrated muriatic acid, it quickly resolves itself into gas, producing much more than its own weight of elastic fluid, which proves to be pure chlorine, and the solution is found to contain muriate of ammonia. In concentrated nitric acid it affords azote, and in diluted sulphuric acid, a mixture of azote and oxygen. It detonates in a strong solution of ammonia, but in a weak solution it produces azote. It combines with the compounds of chlorine with sulphur and phosphorus, and with the alcohol of sulphur, without any violence of action; and it dissolves in moderately strong fluoric acid, giving it the power of acting upon silver. Placed in contact with pure mercury, without the presence of any moisture, a white powder and azote are formed. The white powder when examined, is a mixture of calomel and corrosive sublimate.

Considerable difficulty occurred effecting the decomposition of it in such a manner as to afford a correct knowledge of the proportion in which its constituent principles were combined, as only very small quantities could be acted upon without danger. In a very accurate experiment, in which $\frac{7}{10}$ of a grain of the compound, were decomposed by mercury, 49 grain measures of azote were produced. The white powder which was formed, sublimed unaltered with giving off any elastic or fluid matter, which could hardly have been the case, if it had contained either hydrogen or oxygen, or both. The results of this decomposition would give 57 of azote to 643 of chlorine in weight, or 19 to 81 in volume, as the proportion of its constituents.

Its action with muriatic acid appeared to Sir H. to afford a more decisive mode, for as chlorine and muriate of ammonia are the products formed, it was evident that part of the acid was decomposed, by the attraction of the compound for hydrogen to form ammonia, so that the chlorine liberated, is the joint product of both the compounds, and the quantity of chlorine produced from a certain quantity of the compound being therefore known, its composition becomes a matter of precise calculation:—

For ammonia being formed of three volumes of hydrogen, and one of azote, and muriatic acid of one volume of hydrogen and one of chlorine, it follows that for every three volumes of chlorine evolved, by the decomposition of muriatic acid, one volume of azote must be detached from the compound; and the weight of chlorine in the compound must be less than the weight of the whole quantity of chlorine produced, by a portion, which is to the azote in the compound as 295 to 2295, if the relative specific gravities of the two gases be considered as 2,627. and 1.

Still difficulty occurred in effecting the decomposition in this manner, in consequence of the chlorine being absorbed by the muriatic acid, which occasioned some variation in the results. The effect, however, of solutions of chlorine, in discharging the colour of the solution of indigo in sulphuric acid, was employed as the means of determining the quantity of chlorine which was absorbed by the solution of muriatic acid, for the effect of a solution of chlorine, in depriving the indigo solution of its colour, is directly as the proportion of chlorine which it contains.

By these methods Sir H. determined, that 1, 61 grains of chlorine are produced by the action of one grain of the compound on a solution of muriatic acid; and on the data already given, this quantity will give for the composition of the new substance 91. of chlorine, and 9 of azote, in weight, or, in volume, nearly 119 to 30. From these results Sir H. concludes, on the principle of Gay Lussac, that gaseous bodies combine in definite volumes, its real composition is four volumes of chlorine to one of azote, or, according to the theory of definite proportions, of one proportion of azote 26. and four proportions of chlorine 261. Sir H. remarks, that this compound affords the only example yet known of one proportion of a substance uniting with four proportions of another, without any intermediate combination of the same substances in smaller proportions having been discovered; and it affords a proof that there is no strict law of analogy which regulates the combinations of any given body with other substances.

XXIX. Experiments on the Production of Cold by the Evaporation of the Sulphuret of Carbon. By Alexander Marcet, M. D. F. R. S. one of the Physicians to Guy's Hospital.

The remarkable volatility of the sulphuret of carbon, a property which was noticed by Dr. M. and Prof. Berzelius, in their communication on the subject of this compound, renders it one of the most powerful agents yet discovered in producing a rapid and considerable diminution of temperature. By comparing its power with those of ether and alcohol, Dr. M. found that the bulb of the thermometer, covered with flannel or lint, and wetted with the sulphuret, fell from 60° to 0 , during its evaporation, while ether occasioned a diminution to $+20$, and alcohol to about 50° only. This effect was produced by the evaporation in the atmosphere. When the thermometer, with its bulb previously wetted with the sulphuret, was introduced into the receiver of an air pump, and the air exhausted, it fell, in about two minutes, from $+70^{\circ}$ to -70° of Fahrenheit; and Dr. M. remarks, that if the air pump is capable of exhausting the atmosphere until it supports only $\frac{1}{4}$ th of an inch of mercury, the thermometer then falls to -81° or -82° in less than two minutes. This is a degree of cold so many degrees below that at which mercury freezes, that a spirit thermometer is necessary in these experiments.

Dr. M. made some attempts to augment the effect of this property of the sulphuret, but without success; if, however, it should at any time be found practicable to apply the principle of Leslie's method with this substance, a much greater reduction of temperature might be produced than has ever yet been accomplished.

XXX. On a Saline Substance, from Mount Vesuvius. By James Smithson, Esq. F. R. S.

The recent discoveries in chemistry have so much extended the limits of our knowledge, that the phenomena presented by volcanoes cease to be mysterious; and we are almost prepared to refer them to the operation of causes with which we are already acquainted, and of the power of which we can form, to a certain degree, a pretty accurate estimate. A more intimate acquaintance, therefore, with the nature of the substances which are of volcanic origin, becomes of importance in enabling us to apply the facts and principles, already in our possession, to the theory of these stupendous operations of nature.

Mr. Smithson is a decided Huttonian, and he remarks that the proofs we possess of the existence of extensive deposits of

combustible matter in the interior of our globe, lead us to regard volcanoes no longer as local phenomena, but as principal elements in the history of the earth, and as affording us the means of connecting its present with its past condition, as well as in some degree with its future destiny.

The substance which has given occasion to the present communication, is a saline substance which had 'flowed out liquid from a small aperture in the cone of Vesuvius,' and was transmitted to Mr. S. from Naples, so far back as May, 1794. He ascertained, at that period, that it consisted chiefly of sulphate of potash, a salt which had never been regarded as a native mineral production. Urged by the progress of discovery since that period, Mr. S. has undertaken a more accurate analysis of this substance, of which this paper contains the details and the results. He found the soluble portion of the substance to consist of sulphate of potash 7.14. sulphate of soda 1.86, muriate of soda 0.46, muriate of ammonia, muriate of copper, and muriate of iron, together 0.54. The insoluble matter consisted of submuriate of copper, and a yellow ochreous powder, which Mr. S. regards as a submuriate of iron, but its small quantity and its admixture with the submuriate of copper, prevented his submitting it to a perfectly rigorous examination. It appears, therefore, that this volcanic production contained nine distinct varieties of matter, and all of them chemical combinations.

XXXI. *Some Experiments and Observations on the Substances produced in different Chemical Processes on Fluor Spar.* By Sir Humphry Davy, LL. D. F.R.S. V. P. R. I.

In the Bakerian Lecture for 1808, Sir H. has related some experiments on the action of potassium on silicated fluoric acid gas, from which he was led to infer that the acid was decomposed, and that oxygen was probably separated from it by the potassium. The same conclusion was drawn from some similar experiments by Gay Lussac and Thenard. This, however, was before the researches of Sir H. on the oxymuriatic gas, had developed those theoretical conclusions on the nature of muriatic acid, which seem to have acquired strength and consistency in proportion as our acquaintance with its relations and analogies have extended.

The suggestions of a Parisian correspondent, M. Ampere, seem first to have led to the train of investigation which is detailed in the present communication. He had concluded from analogical reasoning, that the fluoric acid resembled the muriatic, and was a compound of a substance belonging to the same class of bodies as oxygen and chlorine, united to hydrogen.

These views had originated in the investigations of Sir H. on oxymuriatic gas, and were supported by reasonings drawn from the experiments of Gay Lussac and Thenard.

The fluoric compounds which were the subject of the following experiments, were the silicated fluoric acid gas, liquid fluoric acid in its pure state, and the fluo-boric acid gas, which was discovered by Gay Lussac and Thenard. With respect to these compounds, Sir H. justly remarks, that different hypotheses may be formed, on which the facts will admit of explanation, but such is the complicated character of the phenomena which they present in their relation to other bodies, that no explanation can at present be offered which does not involve some degree of conjecture. Sir H. however, seems to regard the hypothesis of his correspondent, M. Ampere, as most conformable to the general series of chemical facts, and the experiments which he relates certainly give support to that theory. As those acids which are known by direct experiment to contain oxygen united to an inflammable base, and water, afford moisture when they enter into combination with ammonia, Sir H. thought it probable, that if the fluoric acid belonged to the class of acids containing oxygen, it would present the same phenomenon on its union with ammonia. An experiment was therefore made with a view to determine this point, and the combination of fluoric acid and ammonia, was made in an apparatus of platinum, but there was no indication whatever of the production of the slightest degree of moisture, so that the liquid fluoric acid can hardly be supposed to contain water. Some solid and perfectly dry fluuate of ammonia, with an equal weight of potassium, was next placed on a tray of platinum, and introduced into a small glass tube, connected with a mercurial apparatus. The application of heat occasioned a violent action and the disengagement of gas. A white solid substance was formed, which proved to be fluuate of potassa; part of the potassium remained on the tray, and the gas which was disengaged, consisted of ammonia and hydrogen, in the proportions of two to one nearly in volume. As no particular precautions, however, had been taken to dry the mercury, this experiment could not be considered as decisive. If, however, the fluuate of ammonia had contained oxygen united to an inflammable base, it might have been expected that it would separate, or enter into some new combination, since this is found to take place with the action of potassium on those ammoniacal salts which contain an acid having oxygen as a constituent principle. The action of the potassium in this experiment, was precisely similar to its action on muriate of ammonia, in which there is an invariable production of ammonia and hydrogen in the proportion of two and

one, muriate of potassa, or (the potassane of Sir H.) being formed at the same time.

As all the substances which contain definite proportions of water, whether acids, alkalies, or oxides, and which are either fluid, or capable of being rendered so by heat, are decomposed by Voltaic electricity, Sir H. determined to submit the pure liquid fluoric acid, to the action of this powerful decomposing principle. Considerable difficulty occurred in doing this, in consequence of the action of the acid on glass and on all animal and vegetable substances. It was accomplished, however, by cementing a wire of platina in a piece of horn silver, and by inverting it in a tray of platina filled with the acid. A very weak Voltaic power was employed, and the apparatus was kept cool by a freezing mixture. The platina wire at the positive pole was rapidly corroded, and became covered with a chocolate powder, and a gas was disengaged at the negative pole, which inflamed like hydrogen, but which could not be collected in sufficient quantity to submit it to accurate examination. When the acid was pure no other inflammable matter was produced. Other attempts were made to electrize the acid with the positive surface formed by plumbago, and also by connecting a piece of charcoal to the extremity of the platina wire, but these expedients gave no satisfactory results; the plumbago was speedily destroyed, and the charcoal afforded no efficient protection to the platina wire. Nor was an experiment made by taking sparks in the acid from the powerful batteries of the Royal Institution, more successful, for though some gas appeared to be produced at both the positive and the negative surfaces, yet there was reason to conclude that it was only the acid rendered gaseous, but not decomposed.

From the result of these experiments, therefore, Sir H. concludes, that 'the phenomena of Voltaic electrization of fluoric acid, present no evidences in favour of its containing a peculiar combustible substance and oxygen, and the most simple mode of explaining them, is, by supposing the fluoric acid, like muriatic acid, to be composed of hydrogen, and a substance, as yet unknown in a separate form, possessed like oxygen and chlorine of the negative electrical energy, and hence determined to the positive surface, and strongly attracted by metallic substances.' Having failed in effecting the decomposition of the acid by these means, and assuming its analogy with chlorine, that the fluoric compounds consist of inflammable bodies united to a peculiar principle, it is evident that all attempts to decompose the fluoric acid by inflammable bodies, could only lead to the formation of new combinations. Sir H. was, therefore, led by analogy, to attempt its separation from the bases with which

it might be combined, by means of oxygen, or chlorine, for as chlorine is in some cases detached from hydrogen by oxygen, and oxygen, in a number of instances, is detached from the metals by chlorine, he thought it probable that the separation of the fluoric principle might be effected by similar means. The dry fluates of silver, mercury, and potassa, were selected for these experiments. These salts, in a perfectly dry state, were introduced into glass retorts which were exhausted, and then filled with chlorine, and the part of the retort in contact with the salt was then heated to redness. Considerable action took place, the fluuate of mercury was converted into corrosive sublimate, and the fluuate of silver, into horn silver. There was violent action on the retort, and when the results were examined, there was a considerable absorption of chlorine, and a production of silicated fluoric acid gas, and oxygen gas. The fluates of potassa and soda, were converted into muriates with precisely the same phenomena. Sir H. conceives, that the oxygen, in these cases, was disengaged from the silica and soda contained in the glass, and with which the fluoric principle had entered into combination, after it had been expelled from its former combination by the chlorine. The experiments with the fluates of potassa and soda, were afterwards repeated on trays of platina and enclosed in tubes of the same metal. There was a considerable absorption of chlorine, and the fluates were converted into muriates with an increase of weight, no new gaseous matter could be detected in the chlorine contained in the tube but the platina was acted upon, and covered with a reddish brown powder. Tubes of silver, and glass coated with the combinations of chlorine with copper and silver, were also employed in these experiments, but without obtaining more successful results;—the silver was acted upon to a considerable degree and the coating of the glass was fused by the heat employed in the experiments, and the glass consequently was not protected from the action of the fluoric principle. In one experiment, however, made in a tube of platina which had been coated with fused muriate of potassa, the gas, when allowed to escape into the atmosphere, had a peculiar, disagreeable smell different from that of chlorine, which still formed the greater part of the gas in the tube. A portion of this gas, transferred to a glass receiver over mercury, acted upon the glass, silicated fluoric acid gas being produced; but, in this instance, the platina tray had been corroded, and the brown powder formed.

Sir H. made several attempts to disengage hydrogen from the liquid fluoric acid by the agency of oxygen and chlorine, but it was not decomposed, when passed through a tube of platina heated to redness, with chlorine, nor by being distilled from

alts containing abundance of oxygen, or chlorine. The fluates of lead and mercury were distilled also with phosphorus and sulphur, with a view to obtain compounds of the fluoric principle with phosphorus and sulphur. In these experiments, decomposition took place, the glass vessels were violently acted upon, sulphurets and phosphorets were formed, and minute quantities of a limpid fluid were condensed in that part of the tube which was cooled by ice; this fluid had the appearance of hydrofluoric acid, and rapidly dissipated itself in white fumes; whether it was a compound of the fluoric principle with the phosphorus or sulphur, or the acid had been formed by the combination of hydrogen derived from these substances, was not ascertained.

From the general results of his investigations, Sir H. thinks it is reasonable to conclude, that there exists in the fluoric compounds a peculiar substance, possessed of strong attraction for metallic bodies and hydrogen, and which, combined with certain inflammable bodies, forms peculiar acids. For this substance is correspondent M. Ampere proposes the name of fluorine.

Dr. Wollaston has observed, that the fluoric acid and its combinations, have very low powers of refracting light, and though the fluoric principle seems to possess higher acidifying and saturating powers than either oxygen or chlorine, yet it is probable that its refracting powers are lower than those of almost any other body.

Art. V. *The Legend of the Velvet Cushion*, in a series of Letters to my Brother Jonathan, who lives in the Country. By Jeremiah Ringletub. 8vo. pp. 322. Williams and Son. Price 6s. 6d. 1815.

THE *jeu d'esprit* of this spirited volume is chiefly in the title-page, advertisement, and first letter. The Author begins in a joke, and seems to promise the lovers of mirth and good humour, no small share of entertainment. For awhile he is vastly amusing; and even our stern and inflexible muscles began to yield to the relaxings of risibility. They were however soon contracted to their former gravity by the altered tones of Jeremiah; and we found him, before many minutes had elapsed, in good earnest on his subject. Now, and then, indeed, he tries to smile; but it is only a gleam of sun-shine in a storm—a forced laugh that seems to indicate more pain than pleasure. On this account, it would have been well, unless he had continued his facetiousness longer, not to have jested at all, but to have begun as he intended to go on, in right sober mood. The mind is not placed by the *debut* of 'Master

'Ringletub of Pogram-Hall,' in a posture of serious thought, and when the queer-looking animal begins to reason like a judge, the transition from levity to reflection is not made in a moment, and it requires an effort for which we were scarcely prepared, to enter at once into his arguments. We confess, however, that an effect was produced by Jeremiah's remarks, which is not always secured even by the grave advices of the pulpit;—we forgot the speaker in the subject: and as thinking is far more natural to us than laughing, we were not sorry, on the whole, to keep on in our usual course. We know not how far our 'Pogram-Hall' friend might have unfitted us for future lucubrations, had he preserved his humour to the end of his correspondence; and we derive consolation from disappointment, by reflecting on its uses!

Our lively Author deserves our sincere congratulations for his happy designation of "*The Velvet Cushion*." He calls it a '*Legend*,' because it is 'a story invented and told for the benefit of the Church.' He could not have suggested a more appropriate title for it. The author of that work has somewhat softened the severity of a few passages, as they appeared in the first edition; but the disingenuous insinuations against Dissenters are still retained, and he cannot be surprised to find that the cause of a calumniated party has yet its advocates and its champions. To defend that party, is the object of the volume before us.

The principal subjects of correspondence in the "*Legend*," are—Catholic Emancipation—the Test and Corporation Acts—and the character of King Charles the First. On the first of these topics the Author is a strenuous and manly advocate; against the penal statutes affecting Dissenters, he reasons with great vigour and eloquence, proving we think by unanswerable arguments, their impolicy and their injustice; and the usurpations and the popery of the unfortunate Charles, he endeavours to establish on the authorities cited by Towgood. Intermingled with those discussions are several digressions and anecdotes, which considerably enliven the work, and accord more completely with the style of familiar correspondence. The general impression we have received from a perusal of the volume, is highly creditable to the polemic and rhetorical talents of the Author. We should imagine him to be well gifted in the faculty of popular argumentation. He possesses considerable powers of reasoning and expansion; and is, we suspect, much more in the habit of declaiming with effect, than writing letters to his brother Jonathan. At the same time, we wish the epistles had been addressed to some real personage, and that he had neither assumed nor invented a fictitious character. If *Peter Plymley* was his first prototype, he has egregiously

ailed in imitating what was the appropriate merit of that political bagatelle. Jeremiah Ringletub is far too polished in his fiction—too elaborate and oratorical in his style of reasoning. In fact, he writes, in the greater part of the correspondence, like a grave dissenting minister, sincerely attached to his own particular department of the religious world, ardently zealous to defend its interests, and prepared to repel with honest indignation all the attempts of artful hostility. We should think, from the tone of confidence with which he asserts his convictions, that he is an eloquent, warm-hearted, and impassioned preacher; that some glowing passages from his *sermons* and *speeches*, have found their way into his letters; that he is not unconscious of his power, and is accustomed to speak "like an oracle!"

There is no resemblance whatsoever between the "Velvet Cushion," and the "Legend." The one abounds in picturesque delineations of character, and in the intermixture of pathetic and devotional sentiment: the other is bold and nervous in the assertion and defence of principles, and is occasionally sarcastic and severe. While the tone of piety pervading the one, heightens the impression of its fallacies, the cast of political declamation that marks the other, diminishes the force of its arguments. The spirit of devotion has the effect of consecrating the errors of the one; the general absence of that spirit too much secularizes even the truths of the other. It must however be observed, that the object of each is exceedingly diverse. Nothing could be easier than to construct a series of dialogues in the style of the Velvet Cushion; and by the association of ludicrous incidents with feeble reasonings, and the confounding of accidental evils with the general tendencies of a system, make the worst causes appear suspicious and indefensible. Let the Church of England be tried by such a criterion, and it would soon be found wanting. But there is one special advantage possessed by the "Legend;" it is manly and ingenuous; and the points in issue are brought directly to the view of the reader, in all their prominences and connexions. If every argument is not equally forcible, all are alike intelligible and undisguised; the opinion is fully developed, and no scope is left for the distortions and exaggerations of a mind that may happen to be more suspicious than the Author's.

It is seldom, of late, that Dissenters have written on the characteristic principles of their profession, except when the hostile or insidious attacks of their neighbours have compelled them to act on the defensive; and in such cases they have been employed, like the Author of the Legend, chiefly in skirmishing operations. In fact, they have been so occupied and absorbed by objects of general utility, and they have so willingly merged

all their peculiar views in the great and equalizing distinction of the 'common faith,' that they have felt reluctant to engage in controversies of minor importance. In uniting with other Christians to promote the general cause of religion, they felt that no sacrifice of interest or inclination was requisite on their part to support that union. They never feared that Bibles 'without note or comment' would be injurious to their particular interests! No one ever heard from them, at public meetings, the language of apology for becoming advocates of a Society that employs itself solely in distributing Bibles; and none of their party have been found hardy enough to throw out the libellous insinuation, that by such exertions they would ultimately endanger the cause of Dissent! At the same time, it was not *for* the cause of Dissent, nor indeed with any party views, that they engaged in this active and enlarged co-operation. They had far higher aims, and were influenced by far nobler motives. Hence, they willingly gave the precedence to those, whose connexion with the Establishment led them to think, that precedence was their due. They suffered the mortification on various occasions, of hearing their friends and colleagues, enter into very elaborate proofs of the possibility of joining with Dissenters, and yet being loyal subjects of the government; and the equal possibility of Dissenters being, after all, Christians—and giving Bibles to the poor without polluting those donations by their touch! Still apologies and indications were not sufficient to prove the policy or the safety of Churchmen associating with Dissenters. Episcopal manifestoes, marked alike with imbecility and ignorance, were published and widely circulated:—but though Dissenters meekly asserted their innocence, and here and there, liberal Churchmen brought forward the proofs of it, the cry of ecclesiastical vengeance continued to be propagated; and unhappily, it is yet as clamorous as ever! Even Clergymen reputedly evangelical as they call themselves, are now occasionally found to display as much splenetic hostility against nonconformity as their unenlightened brethren; and instances have occurred, in which their rancour has been far more inveterate. Suspected by their superiors, to be not so well affected as they ought to be, towards the venerable Establishment, they have been determined to outstrip their contemporaries in illiberality, and to give lucid proof that they had no good-will to sectaries. The Dissenters have accounted on this principle, for their proud reserve, their chilling distance and their haughty condescension; they have, notwithstanding these infirmities, (naturally gendered by the spirit of a national hierarchy, and rendered more obvious by the circumstances in which some of the more serious Clergy have been placed,) most cordially rejoiced in their success, and prayed for the extension

their labours. They have been taught by *their* principles to exclaim—"If Christ be preached—we rejoice!"

But there is one effect which, as the result of recent attempts to revive the spirit of hostility towards Dissenters, will be of essential advantage to their cause. Compelled *as they now are*, by every method in their power, to state and vindicate their peculiar principles, those principles will become more generally known, and be more warmly cherished. The continued sun-shine of friendly feeling might have relaxed the tenacity of their grasp; but the storm which now rages against them, and to which, in some cases, those are contributing their proportion, who might have known better, will only make them wrap about them more firmly than ever the garment of liberty and independence. They will not be afraid or ashamed to avow their reasons of dissent; and the circulation of them must inevitably produce impression. The *idola theatri*—the prejudices which rest *only* on the authority of others—the mere *dicta* of philosophers and priests, have long since lost the power they once possessed; and men will venture to think and to speak for themselves. Where habits of free inquiry are formed, and in exact proportion to their influence, the reasons of nonconformity will be fairly and candidly investigated; and they require investigation only, in order to ensure their success.

We rejoice in the anticipation of these results, because in this country we consider what has been termed the cause of Dissent, to be intimately combined with the progress of religious liberty and evangelical truth. It is the testimony of one, who can never be suspected of any favourable leaning towards the party, and whose political predilections were as much opposed to their general principles, as his scepticism, that 'the precious spark of liberty was kindled and preserved by *the Puritans alone*; and it was [is] to this *sect*, the English owe the whole freedom of their constitution.* But our readers shall have a specimen of our Author's reasonings on this subject.

'Established churches have never been friendly to liberty.—"The very constitution of a hierarchy fits it for the work of tyranny. It is much better suited to the genius of an arbitrary than a free government. To the former it may yield a principal support; to the latter it must ever prove dangerous. The clergy considering themselves as the allies of the state, yet, having no civil department, are disposed on all occasions to strike in with the current of the court: nor are they likely to confine the obligation to obedience within any just and reasonable bounds. They will insensibly become an army of spiritual janizaries. Depending, as they every where must, upon the sovereign, his prerogative can never be exalted too high for their emoluments, nor

* Hume.

can any better instruments be contrived for the accomplishment of arbitrary designs. Their compact and united form, composing a chain of various links, which hangs suspended from the throne, admirably fits them for conveying that impression, which may soothe, inflame, or mislead the people."

'When the comprehension bill was brought before Parliament several Members in the House of Commons, who were the friends of the Dissenters, opposed it on the following singular ground: "If this bill," say they, "pass into a law, two thirds of the Dissenting Ministers may enter the establishment. They will, in consequence of this, acquire the *esprit de corps* of the clerical order; at any rate their successors will. Our clergy were never the friends of liberty—we have found them to be the advocates of prerogative, and unconcerned about the rights of the people. The puritans, the nonconformists and the dissenters, have been the steadfast assertors of the liberties of Englishmen. If the number of those who continue out of the church be considerable, they will have an influence which will be beneficial to the cause of freedom, and the act which tolerates them will remain inviolate.'" *Legend*, pp. 179, 181.

The present age is distinguished above all that preceded it by the general spirit of liberality, and the prevalence of accurate and scriptural views of the rights of conscience. There is a *national* as well as a *legal* toleration; and this state of feeling is chiefly to be attributed to the diffusion of knowledge, and to a practical demonstration of the benefits that result from the suppression of force, and the virtual, if not the formal repeal of penal statutes on the subject of religion. But the fact that the repeal is not formal, is a decisive proof that the hierarchy of England is what it was in the days of the Stuarts; and that our liberty is not in the slightest degree to be ascribed to any change for the better, in our ecclesiastical constitution. Individuals connected with the Church, and the Clergy in general have of course been subjected to the general causes of melioration; and the change which has been gradually wrought on the public mind, by the obvious inadequacy of magistrates' pillories, and prisons, to arrest the progress of religious innovations, has necessarily had its share of influence on our 'bishops, curates, and all congregations committed to their charge.' But for this melioration we are indebted to the *State*—not to the *Church*; to the spirit of the times, not to the principles of the Establishment. If the clergy *as a body* were friendly to the cause of religious liberty, why are the Test and Corporation-acts still on our statute-book? Why are they generally found supporters of every measure that tends to restrict the privileges of Dissenters, and sufficiently lukewarm about the rights and claims of their seceding brethren? Did the Clergy—even the *evangelical* Clergy, display any interest in the exertions that were recently made, to resist a legislative encroachment on those

rights? No—they “passed by on the other side!” Individuals might unite with the Dissenters; but there was no declaration of *general feeling* on the subject; and the major part of the Clergy were every where active supporters of the projected amendment. Had there been any alteration for the better in the principles and spirit of the hierarchy, any disposition to recognise the sacred rights of conscience, any radical change in the genius and tendency of the system, it was natural at that time to look for the proofs of it: but nothing of the kind appeared.

‘Had the state,’ observes our Author, on the subject of the ‘Test,’ ‘been left to its own unbiassed judgment and decision, this relic of a barbarous age would long since have disappeared. The church, and the church alone is responsible for its continuance; nor will she remove the stigma of intolerance from her character, till she has employed her powerful influence for the repeal of every persecuting statute. Let the bishops in the upper house, and the friends and brothers of the Clergy in the lower, present petitions to parliament for this express purpose; and in three nights, the triumph of justice over intolerance would be proclaimed, to gladden the hearts of persecuted millions. That such an application will ever be made, from this quarter, is perhaps too much to hope from human nature; but until this step is taken, the smoothness of the Velvet Cushion, and the adroitness with which it throws the onus of persecution from where it ought to rest, upon the short-sightedness of the Legislature, will only lead some to imagine what an admirable cushion it would be for one of the modern descendants of Layola. When the Dissenters made their last great effort to obtain relief from the oppression of the Test laws, during the administration of Mr. Pitt, that minister felt every disposition to espouse their cause; *but the church set up its usual alarm, and the project failed.*’ pp. 150—151.

The cause of dissent is vitally connected with the essential principles of the Protestant cause. Those principles are—the *exclusive sufficiency of Scripture, and the right of private judgement*. Abandon them, or modify and neutralize them by methods of human decree, and you identify that cause, as far as the modification extends, with “the mystery of iniquity.” Within those limits it is no longer protestantism, but popery; and popery without its consistency. It is the obvious excellence of dissent, that it exhibits an undisguised, unequivocal, and prominent testimony in favour of those principles. It perpetually recognises them as unquestionable and authoritative; and hence the just views of religious liberty, which pervade the body of Dissenters. For the same reason, they are always the firm and consistent supporters of Civil Liberty, and most determined advocates of the British Constitution. We believe there is not a Dissenter in the kingdom, who would not subscribe *ex animo* to the following spirited and just observations.

'The last of the Stuarts was driven from a throne, of which the whole family had proved themselves unworthy; and the nation has ever since been freed from all oppression, except what a persecuting church has laboured to exercise, controuled, however, by the wholesome restraints of law, and the mild, counteracting influence of the House of Hanover,—which God Almighty long bless and preserve! Jonathan, I am a loyal man, and would most willingly lay down my life for a monarch who rules by the laws, and derives his title from the people. I would maintain the monarchy in splendour, and reverence even the persons of kings; but I will never abet tyranny. We have a constitution, and while it lasts the nation will be happy. An essential part of that constitution is the monarchy, and that monarchy will continue as long as the rocks by which we are surrounded, if it so long answer the end of its creation. When it ceases to do this, it will sap the foundation of its own stability, and a pebble will overthrow it: Those writers who deify tyrants, and impugn the principles which placed the Guelphs upon the throne; who would extinguish the flame of freedom, and identify loyalty and the blind servility of superstitious homage to the false divinity of kings, are preparing the way for oppressions, which are always avenged by their own inevitable consequences.' pp. 244—245.

Such are the genuine and constitutional sentiments of Dissenters. Their attachment to the reigning family, and the principles which established them on the throne, has been uniformly consistent and indisputable: and, notwithstanding, they are still proscribed and calumniated! The principle of the Test and Corporation Acts, is most ably exposed and refuted in the volume before us: there is however one view of them to which we particularly wish to direct the attention of our readers; and, as it constitutes the fundamental ground of rational dissent, we trust a minute detail of our convictions will not be deemed irrelevant to the object immediately before us.

The enactment of penal and disqualifying statutes, is founded on the implied right of the civil magistrate to interfere in matters of religion. It is freely conceded, that to a certain extent moral and religious principles must be recognised and sanctioned by the legislative authorities. Could we imagine a social compact formed on the principles of absolute scepticism, and excluding all references to the existence of a Supreme Being, and the consequent responsibility of human actions before a Divine tribunal, we should behold a state of society, very different from any which we have been accustomed to contemplate. There could, in fact, be no society at all. The volcanic eruptions of anarchy and crime would scatter and annihilate every bond of union. There must be, in the radical principles of a well constructed government, a direct recognition of the existence of a Deity, and of a future state of rewards and punishments. Without this incorporation of the primary truths which

constitute the foundation of all morality and religion, the authority of civil government would be subverted, and its legislative enactments could secure no permanent influence on the characters and actions of men.

But it is possible for these general convictions to prevail in a particular state or society, and to be at the same time so combined with other sentiments, as to produce among different classes of the community, corresponding diversities of character and of practice. All the while, there may be no infraction whatever, on the order and interests of the community. There may be the same general subjection to the laws, and the same active and patriotic exertion for the public weal. Let us suppose these variously modified sentiments, all, be it remembered, connected with, and springing out of, the principles sanctioned by legislative authority, to operate at length in the formation of *separate voluntary associations*, expressly framed for their support and diffusion, by just and pacific measures. Here an interesting question suggests itself:—Would it be either right or expedient for those who might happen to be entrusted with the legislative or the executive powers of the government, to select from the mass of opposite opinions, that particular system which they, or which the majority, preferred; to attach exclusive privileges and immunities to the advocates and friends of that system; to enact laws for its exclusive support; to give it all the consequence of a monopoly; and to involve dissentients, to any extent whatever, in civil disabilities, as the consequence of their not belonging to this privileged incorporation?—Would this be either *right* or *expedient*?—It is obvious, that the question now proposed, has nothing to do with the comparative superiority of the system referred to. It may be, for all that affects the present inquiry, the most rational combination of principles and institutions, that was ever presented to the world.

But, after all, the simple question is—Should it receive from the authority of civil government, that exclusive patronage which would confer, in any degree, and on its account alone, a monopoly of secular privileges, and subject the adherents of other systems, to any kind of restrictions whatever? The answer to this inquiry, is, in our apprehension, obvious and determinate. Such an incorporation is neither right in point of principle, nor expedient in point of fact. From whom does the magistrate or the government derive the right of interference as to particular opinions and practices on the subject of religion? What is there in the specific design of civil government, to require this interference? What is it to the legislature or the administration of a country, whether I choose to worship God in a conventicle, or in a cathedral; by means of a liturgic service,

or without it? What is there in my conformity to a particular and prescribed mode, to constitute a qualification for secular offices, and why should the conscientious avoidance of that conformity produce a disqualification? It is impossible to resolve these inquiries in any way but one; and a diversity of opinion would never exist on the subject, if the clamours of a predominant faction, and the intellectual and moral obliquity which interest and bigotry impart, had not perverted and confused the understandings of men. Who would think of establishing by law modes of medical practice, or systems of natural philosophy? Religion is a personal conviction of the judgement; and it is impossible that any legitimate control can be exercised over the conscience. Because opinions *cannot* be subjected to the authority and restraints of law, they ought not: actions, and not sentiments, should be guided by its interference; crimes, and not errors, should be restrained by its penalties.

If once we admit the right of the civil magistrate to interfere with religion by rewards and penalties, we instantly recognise a principle, which justifies every exercise of that right, and binds on the necks and consciences of subjects, the yoke of unlimited and unresisting subjection. Individuals can no longer act and think for themselves. The right to legislate, involves in it necessarily, the right to enforce such acts of legislation; and if they may be justly enforced, non-subjection becomes a crime. On these principles, our religion must be continually varying, and adapting itself to the different governments under which we may happen to live. It is needless to say that the Christian Scriptures know nothing of such a right. It is never appealed to or acknowledged. The Saviour solemnly assured his enemies, "that his kingdom was not of this world;" and he clearly defined the extent and limits of obedience to the secular power, by the injunction he addressed to his disciples:—"Render unto Cæsar, the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God, the things that are God's."—There may be other grounds of secession from a religious establishment, distinct from the principle to which we have now adverted; these may be *à posteriori* reasons of dissent, more obvious to general apprehensions, and derived from the actual state and character of that establishment: but the principle referred to applies to *all*, whatever be their specific modification, or their comparative excellencies; and it constitutes the firmest and most consistent basis of rational separation.

The spirit of this principle pervades every part of "The Legend." The writer well understands his subject; and the friends of Nonconformity are under special obligations to him for defending their cause, and exposing the misrepresentations of their opponents. The miscellaneous topics discussed in the

correspondence, prevent us from giving a regular analysis of its reasonings and illustrations; but we have said enough to convey an accurate idea of its merits, and to induce our readers to gratify themselves by perusing it.

The following is a little in the style of the Velvet Cushion, and proves that our Author can *paint* when he pleases, and describe as well as declaim! It exhibits an interesting groupe of contrasts; and with it we shall close our cursory notice of these amusing and well written letters.

Being informed, some time ago, that the Bishop of — was to give a charge to his clergy, I was determined to go and hear him, expecting to find the spirit of a reformer animating a modern prelate. When I arrived, the sermon was ended, the Bishop had left his throne and velvet canopy and was stationed at the altar, sitting, I think, to the left of a richly decorated table, and in the mellowed light of a large painted window. His clergy stood in a semicircle at the bottom of the steps leading to the altar. The rays which came through the colouring of an imposing figure in the groupe, (I believe it was Aaron, the Jewish High Priest,) gave a pale and subdued complexion to the brotherhood. I was just reflecting how it was that none of the painted windows which I had seen, or of which I had heard, had exhibited Jesus in the act of greatness and humility, washing his disciples' feet, when I was roused by his Lordship's voice; the tones were not very agreeable, the sentiments were less so, and the composition was feeble. The air was so cold to my head, that I was just going to put on my hat; the doctrine was still colder to my heart; and I could hardly forbear crying out, "a religion without a Saviour, is a temple without a Shekinah, and its worshippers will all desert it." I saw an old woman, who, I suppose, had the rheumatism, hobbling out. I will follow thought I;—but just at that moment, the Bishop's voice was elevated; there was a general shuffling of feet among the clergy; and I turned towards the apostolic scene. "The church," said he, "has had to withstand the attacks of infidelity, superstition, and that fanaticism which has of late threatened to overthrow the altar and the throne."—Gracefully turning over a leaf, the dignitary proceeded, "Thank God, the Church has successfully resisted all their assaults, and exhibits her divine constitution in her security.—But yet there has arisen a greater cause of alarm within the citadel; impregnable to external violence, there has sprung up from the bosom of the establishment, a race of men, giving to themselves the exclusive and proscribing title of *Evangelical*." Here I observed several of the priests give a side-long glance at a fine-looking aged man. He was nearly bald; a few silver hairs trembled on his temples, to the current, which swept through the long aisles; but his countenance betrayed no agitation. While the bishop expatiated on the danger that must arise from these invidious and secret efforts to undermine and betray the holy, the reformed religion, the full and yet bright eyes of the venerable priest were fixed on a youth, who stood at

some distance from him in the circle, as though he would have said, "See what you have to expect; I have preached Christ" and I will preach Christ, though I should be buried in the ruins of the church: I have stood many such attacks as these! who should the sun of mercy forsake me now that I am old and grey-headed, which amidst the storms and follies of life has never gone down."—I could stay no longer, "Thus it is," muttered, and the vergers gazed at me as I passed—"thus it is the Church of England provides for her people the means of conversion; and this is the boasted independence of her clergy. As far as I can see, the persecuted episcopalian minister was meant for a more independent church. I should as soon lay down my office as my independence. I now preach where and what I please. I mount my pulpit as an ambassador from heaven to earth, "and have no reason to fear, no temptation to flatter." The heavy chime of the clock, as I issued from the stately edifice, reminded me that I had to preach at a village three miles distant—it rained, the bishop's carriage was waiting. As I walked, I meditated on that sublime text—"God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of Christ Jesus my Lord." When I arrived—the barn was full. "The Gothic arches, the solemn light," were wanting, but there was the presence of Him, who has said,—"Where two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." ' pp. 112—115.

Art. VI. *The Paradise of Coquettes, a Poem.* In Nine Parts. pp. lvi. 256. Murray, London, 1814.

THERE is such a thing as the poet of the parlour. For men and women he gives us fine ladies and sweet-dressing gentlemen; for blue skies and green fields, Turkey carpets and rose-wood tables; for proud achievement and 'circumstance of chivalry,' the adventures of a masquerade; for battles of games, an encounter at chess or whist; for spirits, 'the least of whom could wield these elements,' sylphids that dart through the key-hole, and live in the atmosphere of an essence bottle. Such poetry must always, in some degree, put us in the mind of a monkey in man's clothes; but it has its prettinesses. The critic will hardly spend his strength in laying down rules for this mock-poetry. One thing, however, is indispensable: it should be the apparent sport of the writer, a mere jeu d'esprit; if he appears in earnest, we are shocked at the misapplication of his powers.

Herein is the great excellence of the *Rape of the Lock*; Pope is always playing with his subject. Herein too is the secret of the great cumbersomeness and tediousness of the *Triumphs of Temper*; Mr. Hayley is always at full stretch, laying out his

subject in grand divisions, and exhausting all his powers of description and invention upon it. The present writer outdoes Mr. Hayley himself; nothing, we think, could possibly have been devised more heavy, more lumbering, more ludicrously and lamentably cumbrous, than the "*Paradise of Coquettes.*" The poem is divided into nine parts, and consists of certainly fewer than three thousand lines. One whole part is taken up with the monologue of a belle returning at morning from a ball. Then comes, still more tiresome, the genius of coquetry. Three parts are taken up in their long snip-snap speeches. They bend to the star that contains the *Paradise of Coquettes*, and the rest of the poem consists of various descriptions of this paradise, and its inhabitants. The poem, indeed, strictly speaking, is contained in seven parts; the first and the last are the mere prattle of the poet about women.

The poet is not without elegance, considerable powers of language, and a versification polished up into the utmost monopoly of smoothness. We cannot, however, flatter him with the expectation of the popularity he so confidently anticipates.

' So, with unstudied rapture, o'er my page
Shall bend the brightest eyes of every age,
There dwell, unmindful of the evening's show,
Forgot the plume, the tissue, and the beau.
While gloves the prayer-book but on Sundays cross,
And stiff-bound bibles never lose their gloss,
Quick-opening leaves my ready tome shall speak
The dearer daily ritual of the week.
Amid those leaves,—as oft to be survey'd—
Some lover's treasur'd rhymings shall be laid,
The first sweet billet which reveal'd his sigh,
And all which Love makes sense to Beauty's eye.
' When novels weary,—or, all duly done,
The ruthless sire appeas'd, the daughter won,
When marriage, closing each delightful strife,
Leaves the dull husband yawning with his wife,
Still with new rapture shall my page succeed,—
And languid eyes turn brighter, while they read.' pp. 8—9.

We cannot conclude without just hinting, that a person may be witty without being profane, and that there are much better subjects for small witticisms, than the Bible.

Art. VII. *A Practical Treatise on finding the Latitude and Longitude at Sea*; with Tables designed to facilitate the Calculations. Translated from the French of M. de Rossel. By Thomas Myers, A.M. of the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich, and Honorary Member of the Philosophical Society of London. To which are joined an extensive Series of Practical Examples, an Introduction to the Tables, and some additional Tables, by the Translator. Svo. pp. xxxvii. 379. Price 16s. boards. London, G and S. Robinson. 1815.

A WORK calculated to communicate a knowledge of nautical astronomy, or to facilitate its computations, must always in this country meet with early attention, and deserves a candid examination. M. de Rossel, whose performance Mr. Myers has translated, is a man of some celebrity, and both by his theoretical and his practical knowledge, is well qualified to write on subjects connected with navigation. He is a member of the Paris Board of Longitude, a captain in the French navy; he was coadjutor with d'Entrecasteaux in his voyage of discovery, and is the editor of the account of that voyage. De Rossel's treatise is given in the third volume of the *Astronomie Physique* of Biot, who thus describes it in his preface.

'The observations made by M. de Rossel, and the officers who accompanied him, during the voyage, (of d'Entrecasteaux) have been generally regarded as the most exact which have been made in a maritime expedition from our nation; and the manner in which they have been discussed by M. de Rossel, has been considered, with reason, as constituting an excellent treatise on nautical astronomy. It is a treatise of the same kind, but shorter and more simple, which the author has been pleased to add to my work. In it will be found the methods requisite at sea, and, which is not less valuable, they are exhibited under the most commodious and simple forms which can be employed in the applications. Mariners will doubtless remark the ingenious tables which M. de Rossel has computed to facilitate the use of Douwe's method of finding the latitude from two observations of the sun out of the meridian. By means of the tables I refer to, this method, which may frequently be of great utility, will become easy and commodious that there can be no doubt that its use will come familiar to mariners.'

The work is divided into seven chapters. Of these, the first contains preliminary observations, with rules for taking the data of the computations from the Nautical Almanac, or the *Connaissance des Temps*. The second is devoted to the corrections which must be made in the observed altitudes of the celestial bodies, on account of the dip of the horizon, refraction, parallax, the semi-diameters of the luminaries, &c. The third comprises various methods of finding the latitude. The fourth relates to computations of the horary angles, and of altitudes.

the fifth the Author points out the methods of regulating marine chronometers, and of employing them in the determination of the longitude. In the sixth, he exhibits the most useful means of finding the *longitude* from the distances between the moon and the sun, or some fixed stars. And in the seventh, he shews how to ascertain the declination of the magnetic needle by observations of the sun's azimuth or amplitude, and by the astronomical bearings of terrestrial objects.

To these chapters the Author has subjoined, in about twenty pages, some scientific notes, in which the several rules are investigated, and the principles for the construction of the tables developed. Of the formulæ here exhibited, the most elegant, and indeed the most useful, are those of Borda.

'To render the work more complete and better adapted for perfecting the young mariner in the most difficult branches of his art, the translator has added an extensive series of practical examples, and an introduction to the Tables, explanatory of their construction and use; with a table of the Right Ascensions and Declination of the principal fixed stars, used in finding the longitude at sea, and another of the logarithms of numbers, and their complements, to an extent sufficient for the work. To these he has likewise subjoined a Table, the logarithmic sines and cosines, with their complements, and differences for every ten seconds of a degree, and also the logarithmic tangents and co-tangents, with their differences corresponding to every ten seconds. These, he trusts, will be found more convenient than the logarithmic tables in common use. A new and easy method of clearing the distance, lately published by the Rev. Dr. Brinkley, Professor of Astronomy in the University of Dublin, has likewise been added to the present work, and accompanied by a table of natural versed sines, by means of which the solution of this troublesome problem is greatly facilitated.'

Having presented this general view of the treatise before us, it will not be necessary to enter very much into detail. The Author has evidently written for the use of men who have but little mathematical knowledge; and to such the work will undoubtedly be useful. His precepts are such as cannot easily be misunderstood; and the examples by which he shews their application are well calculated to remove ambiguity and prevent mistake. The additional examples which the Translator has been at the pains to compute, tend still farther to elucidate the methods laid down by M. de Rossel; and are sufficiently numerous to give facility in the practice to any person who will carefully repeat the computations. Dr. Brinkley's rule for 'clearing the lunar distances,' is comparatively simple, easy in application, and free from ambiguity. We regret that Mr Myers has not accompanied it with its demonstration. We think, too, that he should have incorporated into his useful Appendix, the inge-

nious method of clearing the lunar distances invented by Mr. Mendoza de Rios, as well as the most approved methods of finding the longitude by an observation of the distance between the moon and a planet, by an occultation of a fixed star by the moon, and by the eclipses of Jupiter's satellites. The latter method, it is true, cannot be conveniently employed at sea; but it may on shore; and is often extremely useful in determining the position of unknown islands, &c. where vessels may anchor.

Altogether, however, the Translator's additions are judicious, and calculated for utility. The translation itself, though by no means close, is in general correct and perspicuous. Yet there are a few oversights which rather startled us, and for which we know not how to account; since the volume does not, in other respects, exhibit marks of inadvertence.

Thus, at page 106, the passage—'Ainsi l'on peut, si on le préfère, observer les hauteurs qui doivent servir à corriger la distance,' is indistinctly rendered—'Thus, if preferred, the altitudes for correcting the distance may be observed.'

At page 119, where the passage translated is—'On peut les assurer que ce qu'ils pourraient avoir de pénible et de fastidieux dans le commencement, disparaîtra bientôt: il ne faut s'y exercer que pendant bien peu de tems, pour parvenir à se les rendre familiers.' Mr. Myers presents this rendering—'What they may find difficult and tedious at the beginning will soon disappear: for by exercising themselves during a short time will render the calculations familiar.'

At page 120—'Dans les circonstances les moins favorables'—is rendered—'in the most favourable circumstances.' And 'aplatissement' is translated by the technical word 'ellipticity'; the preferable term is 'compression.'

At page 126, the Translator gives 'now' for 'cependant,' when the connexion clearly requires *yet*, or *nevertheless*. And *most*, instead of *more*, is given as the translation of *plus*.

At page 135 Mr. Myers translates 'On vient de donner' by 'Having given;' and 'Ce sont ces,' by 'It is these.'

And at page 148, we have 'Suivre la méthode qui va être indiquée,' transmuted into 'The following method should be adopted;' while, within five lines, '*Je suppose* dans tout ce qui va être dit,' is translated '*It may be supposed* from what has been said.' We have also immediately after, 'Par un des moyens qui ont été enseignés dans ce chapitre,' turned into 'by the method explained in this chapter.'

Happily, however, inaccuracies of this kind do not occur very frequently: so that, on the whole, the volume merits our recommendation. We cannot conscientiously class it with such works

as "Robertson's Navigation" and "Mackay on the Longitude;" yet it is infinitely superior to the trash which is circulated under the name of J. Hamilton Moore; and we shall, in truth, rejoice to learn that in less than twelve months it has entirely superseded the use of that unscientific and, in many respects, worthless publication.

Art. VIII. *Practical Hints to young Females, on the Duties of a Wife, a Mother, and a Mistress of a Family.* By Mrs. Taylor, of Ongar. Author of 'Maternal Solitude for a Daughter's best Interests.' Third edition, foolscap 8vo. pp. vi. 168. price 5s. Taylor and Hessey, and Conder. 1815.

WE did not intend that the Public should have anticipated us, in our decision upon the merits of this excellent little work; but the appearance of a third edition in the short period that has elapsed since its publication, forms, when the nature of the subject is considered, no equivocal criterion of its value. Some degree of success may be attributable to the name of the Author; but it is no small praise that is implied in having, by her former work, rendered that name so attractive, that another, of a didactic nature, professedly consisting of *Practical Hints*, chiefly addressed to a particular class of society, has thus readily obtained an extensive and unabated circulation.

The characteristic of Mrs. Taylor's writings, may perhaps be stated, in a word, to be unaffected good sense; but to render even good sense, when offered in the shape of advice, interesting or palatable, something else is necessary. Either we must attach ideas of veneration to the speaker, which may invest even the common-place truisms dictated by affection, with the attributes of eloquence, or there must be some charm in the manner in which advice is pressed upon us. The latter is principally the case with the Author of "*Practical Hints*." There is a simplicity of intention, united to an appearance of kind-heartedness and cheerful good-humour; there is so much sweetness of manner, which gives to the most natural thoughts the freshness of conversation; there is such evidence, besides, of the Author's having thought and felt for herself, of her having been at least in her experience, original; and the truths she advances, though sometimes relating to an humble description of duties, are of that undeniable and simple nature, that they are, on that very account, little thought of, and when suggested, strike us as almost possessing novelty: the charm of manner arising from these sources may sufficiently account for the reception which the volume has met with.

The 'Contents' of the volume will give our readers a pretty good idea of its design. They are as follows.

'Introduction—Conduct to the Husband—Domestic Economy—Servants—Education—Sickness—Visitors—Keeping at Home—Recreation—The Step Mother—To the Husband—Conclusion.'

The work is professedly addressed to females in the middle ranks of society, who 'yet occupy a station of sufficient eminence to render their conduct highly important to society.' Its design is 'to promote domestic virtue, and to preserve the happiness of the fireside.' The following judicious remarks will serve as a specimen of the general style.

'In every kitchen there should be a library for which a judicious selection of books will be requisite, and nothing beyond the comprehension of kitchen readers admitted: but none in the present day need be at a loss for appropriate works, when, beside other things, many excellent tracts may be procured for the instruction of the poor. Perhaps Mrs. More's Cheap Repository would stand pre-eminent in such a collection; as the lessons there given, and the examples exhibited, judiciously blend amusement with instruction. And here let me drop a hint respecting the choice of such publications: many well-meaning and zealous Christians really counteract the good they intend to do, by refusing to distribute those which are of a lively and entertaining nature, forgetting that the readers they wish to serve, require to be enticed to peruse; that they take the alarm at an introduction too serious, and rarely then go on to the end. Such persons have been known to throw away tracts put into their hands, merely from a sight of their solemn and injudicious titles. Our Saviour pursued a different course, frequently introducing parables of a very entertaining kind: and were these zealous disciples to study human nature in general, and especially the heart in its unconverted state, they might perceive the utility of those innocent baits, which more judicious Christians may set to catch souls. They appear not sufficiently to distinguish between their own sensations, which revolt at every thing that is not expressly serious, and the sensations of those who revolt still more against all that is.' pp. 41, 42.

These hints are professedly *practical*: they are therefore sometimes minute, and may appear trivial. There are some admirable hints under the head of Education. Some of the anecdotes, we thought, might as well have been omitted, especially that at page 7. Whoever that gentleman was, he did not discover the delicacy, the feeling, or the good sense of Mrs. Taylor. Upon the whole, we strongly recommend these "*Practical Hints*," to the attention of young Females, who are not the only description of persons, however, that may peruse them with advantage.

Art. IX. *The Importance of an Evangelical Ministry, a Sermon*, delivered at the Settlement of the Rev. Arthur Tidman, as Pastor of the Congregation of Protestant Dissenters, meeting in Endless Street Chapel, Salisbury, April 6, 1815. By William Jay. 8vo. pp 48. price 1s 6d Bath. 1815.

THERE have been few preachers, among the Dissenters, who have so easily acquired distinction, and have stood so well the test of popularity, as the author of this Sermon. As a pulpit-orator, he has beyond most others succeeded, without the aid either of a meretricious style, or of any affectation of manner, in impressing his audience, and in fixing the attention he has conciliated,—in fact, in making his subject felt, by communicating to his hearers the feelings it awakened in himself. Natural talent is certainly, in the present instance, to be considered as having a considerable share in imparting this efficacy to the simple addresses of the preacher. But neither genius nor learning is competent to produce the effect. Perhaps the secret is developed in a striking passage which occurs in the Sermon before us.

‘But, that you may be a savour of Christ, there must be a regard to the *manner*, as well as the *subject* of your preaching. The poet, in speaking of government, has said,

“Whate’er is best administer’d is best.”

The same may be nearly said with regard to sermons. There is not such a marvellous difference between the thoughts and arrangements of one preacher, and another, as some imagine. But, who has not been struck with the difference of the impression, and effect? One man shall speak; and how dry, and sapless, and uninteresting is he! Let another deliver the very same things, and there is a savour that gives them freshness: the things seem perfectly new. To know how to acquire this, is a secret which I hope you are acquainted with. It is to live out of the spirit of the world, and to walk much with God alone; it is to keep conscience alive and awake; it is to maintain a deep sense of the value of the soul and the importance of eternal salvation; it is to keep the mind in the things of God by habitual meditation; it is to cherish the devotional affections; it is to speak from the heart, to speak experimentally, to speak under a mixture of solemn and tender feelings;—it is to speak with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven, in answer to strong cryings and tears. pp. 25—27.

Our limits will not allow us to speak of this sermon, except in general terms; nor is it necessary. Single sermons are scarcely subjects for criticism, and Mr. Jay is already sufficiently known to the public to enable our readers to appreciate his

productions. That they should suffer in effect on perusal, from wanting the enunciation of the Author, and the freshness of verbal utterance, is no more than must be conceded to most published discourses. The profuse and lengthened quotations from Scripture in particular, which Mr. Jay accustoms himself to introduce in the pulpit, often with the happiest effect, exhibit in a printed Sermon, a heavy appearance. Mr. Jay generally abstains from criticism. The text of the present sermon (2 Cor. ii. 15, 16.) seems, to have required some elucidation. The discourse abounds, however, with striking passages, strongly characteristic, and deserving of deep attention from all who are sensible of the 'importance of an *Evangelical Ministry*.'

Art. X. *Hebrew Melodies*. By Lord Byron. 8vo. pp. 54. price 4s. 6d. Murray. 1815.

HERE, certainly, his Lordship has failed: instead of rising above his subject, as he has been accustomed to do, he has sunk under it. Not that the failure is of a kind likely to injure his reputation as a poet: these songs, by the help of the melodies for which they were written, and under the sanction of their Author's name, stand a fair chance of rivalling in popularity the compositions of his friend More, of which indeed they often reminded us. The failure to which we allude, is one that respects taste and judgement, and consists in attempting to accommodate subjects selected from the Hebrew Scriptures to the light measures of a love song, at the expense of every thing characteristic of the scope and purpose of the original. The following specimen is taken at random.

JEPHTHA'S DAUGHTER.

'Since our Country, our God—Oh, my Sire!
Demand that thy Daughter expire;
Since thy triumph was bought by thy vow—
Strike the bosom that's bared for thee now!

'And the voice of my mourning is o'er,
And the mountains behold me no more;
If the hand that I love lay me low,
There cannot be pain in the blow!

'And of this, oh, my Father! be sure—
That the blood of thy child is as pure
As the blessing I beg ere it flew,
And the last thought that soothes me below.

‘ Though the virgins of Salem lament,
Be the judge and the hero unbent !
I have won the great battle for thee,
And my Father and Country are free !

‘ When this blood of thy giving hath gush’d,
When the voice that thou lovest is hush’d,
Let my memory still be thy pride,
And forget not I smiled as I died.’ pp. 13, 14.

In this, and the greater part of these compositions, the reader will seek in vain to discover the Author of the *Corsair*; there is neither depth of feeling, nor vigour of expression, nor play of fancy, to redeem them from the condemnation to which, on the score of taste, putting aside all religious considerations, they are liable. A ballad, entitled ‘ *Vision of Belshazzar*,’ begins in the following style

‘ The King was on his throne,
The Satraps throng’d the hall ;
A thousand bright lamps shone
O’er that high festival.
A thousand cups of gold,
In Judah deem’d divine—
Jehovah’s vessels hold
The godless Heathen’s wine !

‘ In that same hour and hall, &c. &c.

Jam satis.—It is perhaps unnecessary to remark, that in these ‘ *Hebrew Melodies*,’ though there may be some melody, there is nothing beyond the titles and the occasional introduction of a name, to support the designation of Hebrew: unless the fact of their having been written for Jewish airs is thought sufficient. One is at a loss to imagine how an admirer of the poetical beauties only, of the Old Testament writings, could sit down to execute such a travestie of their genuine character.—‘ King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets ?’—In one respect alone they are Jewish poems:—We allude in particular to such as that ‘ *On the day of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus*.’ They are as *Jewish*, in opposition to every thing *Christian*, as Messrs. Nathan and Braham could have desired.

The following is one of the happiest efforts in the collection.

THE WILD GAZELLE.

‘ The wild Gazelle on Judah’s hills
Exulting yet may bound,
And drink from all the living rills

That gush on holy ground;
 Its airy step and glorious eye
 May glance in tameless transport by :—

‘ A step as fleet, an eye more bright,
 Hath Judah witnessed there ;
 And o’er her scenes of lost delight
 Inhabitants more fair.
 The cedars wave on Lebanon,
 But Judah’s statelier maids are gone !

‘ More blest each palm that shades those plains
 Than Israel’s scattered race ;
 For, taking root, it there remains
 In solitary grace :
 It cannot quit its place of birth,
 It will not live in other earth.

‘ But we must wander witheringly,
 In other lands to die ;
 And where our father’s ashes be,
 Our own may never lie :
 Our temple hath not left a stone,
 And Mockery sits on Salem’s throne.’ pp. 9, 10.

Shall we be told that Lord Byron has given us another instance of the impossibility of succeeding in Sacred Poetry?—We reply, that these specimens only afford a fresh proof, which was not wanted, that the Scriptures are not honoured by the attempts of mere artists or poets to illustrate them ;—that something besides genius is necessary in order to secure success ; that devotional feeling and religious knowledge are no less indispensable requisites ; that, in order to sweep the harp of David, a man needs be not only pre-eminently a poet, but emphatically a Christian. Although subjects relating to religion are, from their very sublimity, less susceptible of ornament than the ordinary themes of poetry, and the feelings connected with the sacred subjects, from their very elevation, less easily combine with the materials of fancy, we can never consent to dissociate poetry from its noblest purpose. We trust that some Christian lyrist, gifted with genius equal to that of our noble Author, may yet arise to vindicate the themes he has profaned. It ought to excite no surprise, that the hand of Genius itself should become withered by an unhallowed attempt to touch the Ark.

ART. XI. SELECT LITERARY INFORMATION.

* *Gentlemen and Publishers who have works in the press, will oblige the Conductors of the ECLECTIC REVIEW, by sending Information (post paid) of the subject, extent, and probable price of such works; which they may depend upon being communicated to the Public, if consistent with its plan.*

in the press and speedily will be published, (copies to be printed not to exceed number of Subscribers) a new and improved edition of Stephens's Greek Lexicon. To be edited by A. J. Valpy, late Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, and Mr. E. H. Barker, of Trinity College, Cambridge. To be published in parts, at £1. 1s. each—large paper, 2s. each, and to be completed in two or four years, in about twenty-four parts. Present Subscription, 832 small parts, and 73 large. A List of the present Subscribers, with the materials for the improvement of the new edition, inserted in Nos. XIX. and XX. of the Classical Journal, and may be had as at all the Classical Booksellers in London; and Mr. A. J. Valpy's, Tooke's-court, Chancery-lane. No. I. will be published in the ensuing summer.

An Essay on the Original Sources of the pure word, and plain sense of the Hebrew, from the earliest periods of the Jewish Era, to the present. By the Rev. W. L. Bowles.

Mr. Lyon, Hebrew Teacher, has the pleasure to inform his Subscribers and Public, that his Hebrew Grammar and Lexicon, are now in Mr. Valpy's hands. They will be comprised in four volumes, of which the Grammar will complete the first, and which will be published in the ensuing summer.

De Officiis, with English Notes, Critical and Explanatory: the text taken from the best editions: for students in College and Schools. Price 6s. 6d. bound, 12mo.

Fragments of several Orations of Cicero, with a Commentary of Asconius, from original MSS. lately discovered in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, will speedily be published under the direction of Mr. James G. Jackson. The Life and Correspondence of Ladyabella Smart, cousin to James I. of England, compiled from the original
VOL. IV. N. S.

letters (never before published) are preparing for publication.

Mr. Mackenzie has in considerable forwardness, Speculations on Various Subjects; consisting of a series of literary, moral, and religious essays.

The Rev. Wm. Coxe is preparing for the press, Memoirs of John, Duke of Marlborough, chiefly drawn from his private correspondence and family documents, preserved at Blenheim, as well as from other authentic sources never before published; in two quarto volumes, with portraits, maps, plans, &c.

Dr. Reade, of Cork, will soon publish, Optical Outlines of a New Theory of Vision, Light, and Colour, with Experiments on Radiant Caloric.

A Collection of Critical Tracts on English Poetry, by Gascoigne, Webbe, Harington, Campion, and others, edited by Mr. Haselwood, will soon be published.

Mr. Charles Smith, the Artist, who was some time a prisoner in France, has in the press, the Mosiad, or the Deliverance of Israel from Egyptian Bondage, a sacred epic poem.

Mr. Thomas Noble, of Liverpool, is printing in an octavo volume, Hampden, or the Concentric, a Poem.

Dr. Miller, editor of the fourth edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica, intends to publish a New Dictionary of Arts, Sciences, and Miscellaneous Literature, to be called the Encyclopædia Edinensis.

Wm. Pitt, Esq. late of Pendeford, is preparing for the press, a Topographical History of Staffordshire, compiled from the most authentic sources, and to form a large volume in octavo.

A Treatise on Domestic Poultry, Pigeons, and Rabbits, from the memorandums made during nearly forty years practice of Banington Mowbray, Esq. will soon appear.

The Annual Register for 1814, will be ready for publication in a few days.

A Continuation of the pasquinade entitled Bonapartephobia will soon appear.

Dr. Spurzheim is printing, for the use of general readers, *Outlines of his Physiognomical System*; also a new edition of his larger work.

Mr. Astley Cooper is preparing for republication, his work on the *Anatomy and Surgical Treatment of Hernia*.

A new edition, in seven volumes, octavo and quarto, is nearly ready, of *Strype's Ecclesiastical, Historical, and Civil Memorials*, with the pages of the folio edition preserved in the margins.—

This will be followed by a new edition of his *Annals of the Reformation*.

Dr. Campbell's *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History*, in two volumes, reprinting uniform with the new edition of his *Translation of the Gospels*, and will soon appear.

Mr. Blaine is preparing a new edition, entirely remodelled, with numerous alterations and important additions, of the *Outlines of the Veterinary Art*, illustrated by anatomical and other engravings.

Art. XII. LIST OF WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

AGRICULTURE.

Recent and Important National Discoveries of a New System of Farming, Feeding Cattle, &c. at half the usual Expense. Containing—1. Manuring of all Fallows so as to produce great Crops, at little or no Expense, and without the Assistance of either Cart, Waggon, or Horses.—2. Feeding the Straw Beasts fat in Winter, and keeping double the Number.—3. Feeding many Sheep fat extra yearly.—4. Rearing Calves without Milk, and Feeding Horses, Beasts, and Pigs at half the Expense.—5. Producing great Crops of Wheat, &c. without buying any Manure whatever.—6. Saving the Lives of Cattle when at the point of Death. One Person now keeps above 100 Milch Cows after Mr. D.'s Plan. Svo. 10s. 6d. boards.

BIOGRAPHY.

Memoirs of the Abbé Edgeworth; containing his Narrative of the last hours of Louis XVI. By C. Sneyd Edgeworth, post 8vo. 7s. boards.

The Political Life of William Wildman, Viscount Barrington: compiled from original Papers, by his Brother Shute, Bishop of Durham, 8vo. 6s. bds. and in royal 8vo. with a Portrait, price 12s.

The Lives of Edward and John Philips, Nephews and Pupils of Milton: including various particulars of the Literary and Political History of their Times. By William Godwin. To which are added, *Collections for the Life of Milton*, by John Aubrey, F.R.S. 1681, printed from the Manuscript Copy in the Ashmolean Museum; and *the Life of Milton*, by Edward Philips, first printed in 1694. Embellished with an original likeness of President Bradshaw, and two other Portraits, 4to. 2l. 2s. boards.

FINE ARTS.

Twelve Plates, by Stothard, Heath &c. to illustrate Lord Byron's *Poem* in 8vo. 1l. 10s. foolscap 8vo. 18s. 2l. proofs, 4to. 2l. 2s.

The Principles of Practical Perspective; or, *Scenographic Projection* containing universal Rules for delineating Designs on various Surfaces, and taking Views from Nature, by the most simple and expeditious Methods, which are added, Rules for Shading and the Elements of Painting. The whole treated in a Manner calculated to render the Science of Perspective and the Art of Drawing easy of Attainment to every Capacity. By Richard Brown, Architect. Illustrated by 12 one Plates, royal 4to. 2l. 2s. boards.

HISTORY.

The Historical Remembrancer; Epitome of Universal History. David Steuart, Esq. with a Chart, 12 5s.

MEDICINE.

The Morbid Anatomy of the Liver being an Inquiry into the Anatomical Character, Symptoms, and Treatment of certain Diseases which impair or destroy the Structure of that Viscerum. Order I.—*Tumours*. Part II.—*On the Varieties of the Tubercula Diffusa*. J. R. Farre, M.D. In imperial 8vo. illustrated by coloured engravings, price 15s.

The History of the Small Pox. James Moore, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, &c. 8vo. 15s.

Reflections on Fever; intended to point out the Principles upon which a systematic and useful Method of Treatment might be established. By Robert

Calvert, M.D. Physician to the Forces, &c. 8vo. 4s. boards.

Observations upon the Bulam Fever, a Disease which has of late Years prevailed in the West Indies, on the Coast of America, at Gibraltar, Cadiz, and other parts of Spain, with a Collection of Facts proving it to be a contagious Disease. By William Pym, Esq. Deputy Inspector of Hospitals, &c. 8vo. 12s. boards.

A View of the Relations of the Nervous System in Health and in Disease; containing Selections from the Dissertation to which was adjudged the Jacksonian Prize for the year 1813, with additional Illustration and Remarks. By Daniel Pring, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, 8vo. 7s. boards.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Ogles, Duncan, and Coehran's Catalogue of foreign Theological Books, being the principal part of the Library of the late Professor Abresch, of Groningen, containing most books of merit in this department of Literature.

The Rejected Pictures, &c. with descriptive Sketches of the several Compositions, by some celebrated and other Artists: being a Supplement to the Royal Academy Catalogue of this Year. To which are added a few of the secret Reasons for their Rejection. By a distinguished Member of the Hanging Committee, 8vo. 5s. 6d. sewed.

A Tale for Gentle and Simple, 12mo. 7s. bds.

Essays, Religious and Moral, in royal 12mo. 7s. boards.

The Philosophic Mouse: a Work adapted to render Philosophical Subjects pleasing to Juvenile Minds. By Jonathan Greaves, 12mo. 3s. 6d. boards.

The Speeches of the Right Hon. Charles James Fox, in the House of Commons, 6 vols. 8vo. 4l. 4s.

Liberty, Civil and Religious. By a Friend to both, 8vo. 3s.

The Literary and Scientific Pursuits which are encouraged and enforced in the University of Cambridge, briefly described and vindicated, with various Notes. By the Rev. Latham Wainwright, A.M. F.S.A. of Emanuel College in that University, and Rector of Great Brickhill, Bucks, 8vo. 4s. 6d. bds.

NATURAL HISTORY.

Recreations in Natural History; or Popular Sketches of British Quadrupeds: describing their Nature, Habits, and

Dispositions; and interspersed with original Anecdotes. Embellished with seventy-four Engravings on Copper and Wood, from portraits of living Animals, painted by the first Masters, 8vo. 2l. 8s. boards.—royal Paper, at 3l. 12s.

An Introduction to the Study of Conchology: including Observations on the Linnean Genera, and on the Arrangement of M. Lamarck, a Glossary, and a Table of English Names. Illustrated by coloured Plates. By Samuel Brookes, F.L.S. 4to. 3l. 10s. boards, and on large Paper with the Plates highly finished, 5l. 15s. 6d.

POETRY.

Helga, a Poem, in Seven Cantos, with Notes. By the Honorable William Herbert, 8vo. 12s. boards.

The Poetical Works, collected, of the Right Honorable Lord Byron, 4 vols. foolscap 8vo. 1l. 8s. boards.

Ode to Desolation: with some other Poems. By Matthew Weld Harstonge, Esq. 8vo. 7s. boards.

The Missionary, a Poem, with considerable Additions. By the Rev. W. L. Bowles.

Poems, by Hugh Lawton, Esq. in royal 4to. 1l. 5s. boards.

The Maze, a Poem, in foolscap 8vo. 9s. boards.

POLITICAL ECONOMY.

On the Slave Trade, and on the Slavery of Blacks and of Whites. By a Friend of Men of all Colours. Translated from the original French of M. Grégoire, formerly Bishop of Blois. To which are annexed, Prefatory Observations and Notes. By the Translator, 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Recollections of Wales, England, and America. By M. de Chateaubriand, 2 vols. 8vo.

A Historical, Political, and Moral Essay on Revolutions, Ancient and Modern. By M. de Chateaubriand, 8vo. 12s.

A New Map of the World, exhibiting at one View the Extent, Religion, Population, and degrees of Civilization of each Country, with numerous Illustrative Notes. By James Wyld, printed on a large Sheet of Columbian drawing paper, price 7s. 6d.

THEOLOGY.

The Reasons of the Protestant Religion: a Discourse delivered at a Monthly Association of Protestant Dissenting

Ministers and Congregations. By John Pye Smith, D.D. 8vo. 2s.

The Power of God in the Soul, a Sermon. By Joseph Gilbert, 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Sermons on the most important Doctrines of the Gospel. By the Rev. John Thornton, 12mo. 4s. boards.

An Essay on the Doctrine of the Trinity; attempting to prove it by Reason and Demonstration: founded upon Duration and Space, and upon some of the Divine Perfections, some of the Powers of the Human Soul, the Language of Scripture, and Tradition among all Nations. By the Rev. James Kidd, A.M. Minister of the Chapel of Ease, Gilcomston, and Professor of Oriental Languages in the Marischal College and University, Aberdeen, 8vo. 12s. boards.

Remarks on the Effusion of the Fifth Apocalyptic Vial, and the late extraordinary Restoration of the Imperial Revolutionary Government of France. To which is added, a critical Examination of Mr. Frere's Combined View of the Prophecies of Daniel, Esdras, and St. John. By G. S. Faber, B.D. Rector of Long-Newton, Durham, 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A Series of Questions upon the Bible; for the Use of Families and Young Persons: originally composed for Sunday Schools. By the Rev. Edward Stanley, M.A. Rector of Alderley, Cheshire, 3s. 6d. boards.—A separate Key of Reference to each Verse, containing the Answer, may be had, price 1s. 6d.

A Manual of Instruction and Devotion on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. By the Rev. J. Hewlett, foolscap 8vo. 5s.

The Theological, Biblical, and Ecclesiastical Dictionary; serving as a general Note-book to all Passages, Names, and Facts, connected with the Old and New Testament, and with Ecclesiastical History:—and forming a Species of Cyclopædia of Religious Knowledge and Opinions, founded throughout on the most approved Authorities. By John Robinson, D.D. late of Christ's College, Cambridge, Master of the Free Grammar School at Ravenstonedale, Author of the *Archæologia Græca*, the Grammar of History, &c. &c. illustrated by Maps, 8vo. 11. 8s. boards.

Christian Triumph: a Sermon, occasioned by the decease of the Rev. James Wraith, who died in his eighty-first year: delivered at the Protestant Dissenting Meeting-House, in Hampstead, 15th May, 1815. By the Rev. Jacob Snelgar, price 1s. 6d.

TRAVELS AND TOPOGRAPHY.

Letters from Portugal, Spain, and France, written during the Campaigns of 1812-13-14, addressed to a Friend in England, describing the leading Features of the Provinces passed through, and the State of Society, Manners, Habits, &c. of the People. By S. D. Broughton, 8vo. 12s. boards.

Letters from France, written by a Modern Tourist in that Country; and descriptive of some of the most amusing Manners and Customs of the French; with characteristic Illustrations from Drawings on the Spot. By M. S. 8vo. 4s. sewed.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

*** The following Articles, unavoidably deferred for want of room, will appear in the August Number. *Lacretelle's Histoire de France*, *Stewart's Philosophy*, Vol. II., *Anster Fair*, a Poem, *Campbell's Travels in the Interior of Africa*, *Jamieson on the Construction of Maps*, *Park's Travels in Africa*, Vol. II. *Display*, a Tale for Young People: with the conclusion of the Review of *Laurence's Remarks upon Griesbach*.

The Articles on *Horsley on the Psalms*, *Kidd on the Trinity*, *Toulmin's History of Dissenters*, *Butler's Mathematics*, *Gibbons's Posthumous Works*, *Armageddon*, *Clarke on Daniel*, &c. &c. will appear as soon as possible.